The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Volume XXX April, 1956 Number Two

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 82

THE MODERN SOCIAL GOSPEL AND THE WAY OF THE CROSS 83
Guy F. Hershberger

THE DEPENDENCE OF THE FIRST ANABAPTISTS ON LUTHER, ERASMUS, AND ZWINGLI 104
Heinold Fast

THE OFFICE OF ELDER IN ANABAPTIST-MENNONITE HISTORY 120
Cornelius Krahn

THE OFFICE OF BISHOP IN ANABAPTIST-MENNONITE HISTORY 128
Harold S. Bender

NINETEENTH CENTURY EMIGRANTS FROM THE MENNONITE CONGREGATION OF FRIEDELSHEIM IN THE PALATINATE 133
Fritz Braun (Translated by Don Yoder)

BOOK REVIEWS 155
Alice K. Gingerich, *Life and Times of Daniel Kauffman*
Reviewed by Paul Erb
Paul Erb, *The Alpha and the Omega: A Restatement of the Christian Hope in Christ's Coming.*
Reviewed by Chester K. Lehman
Barbara Smucker, *Henry's Red Sea*
Reviewed by Mary Neuhauser Royer

THE HISTORY OF THE PRACTICE OF THE CHRISTIAN ETHIC, WHILE IT CONTAINS many inspiring individual achievements and occasional group performances of a high level, is all too often the history of the failure of Christendom to practice the true discipleship which obedience to the teachings of Jesus requires, and even of its outright abandonment on various grounds. Guy F. Hershberger's Conrad Grebel Lectures, "The Way of the Cross in Human Relations," are essentially a critique of the historical performance and the contemporary practice in the light of the full ethic of the "way of the cross." The section of the lectures which the REVIEW publishes in this issue, "The Modern Social Gospel and the Way of the Cross," lifts out one segment of the historical movement of Christian ethics which has been very influential in recent times, particularly in the person of Walter Rauschenbusch and his teachings, and subjects it to a searching examination from the point of view of the cross ethic. With all its passion for social justice and its corrective of traditional blindness to urgent human needs, the Social Gospel was not, as Hershberger clearly shows, even at its best, the way of the cross. Its too easy optimism, its readiness to identify the kingdom of God with a reformed social order, its dilution of the essentially redemptive Gospel, and its futility in grappling with the basic sinfulness of human society, all marked it ultimately as a reduction of the fullness of the cross ethic demanded by Jesus, even though it left some good in its wake.

THE SUBSTANTIAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ANABAPTISTS AND THE REFORMers, which are most acute in the realm of the doctrine of the church and Christian discipleship, can all too easily obscure the substantial dependence of the Anabaptists upon the Reformers. The Anabaptists were children of the Reformation—legitimate children. They started from the Reformers, and they continued to have much in common with them. They conceived of themselves as completing what the Reformers had begun. Even Zwingli himself declared that the Zurich Anabaptists did not differ from him in any major doctrine, but "only in a few outward things." Heinold Fast pinpoints the dependence of the Anabaptists upon the Reformers, in his significant article in this issue, listing seven major points of dependence upon Luther alone, and proving striking verbal concordances between Grebel and Zwingli by parallel quotations from their writings.

TWO CLOSELY RELATED ARTICLES IN THIS ISSUE TRACE THE PRACTICE REGARDING the major church office of bishop-elder in Anabaptist-Mennonite history, one (elder) following the Dutch-Prussian-Russian tradition, the other (bishop) the Swiss-South German-Pennsylvania tradition. Together they give the best available history of this aspect of ecclesiastical polity in the Anabaptist-Mennonite movement.

FRITZ BRAUN'S "NINETEENTH CENTURY EMIGRANTS FROM THE MENNONITE CONgregation of Friedelsheim" in this issue is a companion piece to Don Yoder's "Risser Letters" in the previous issue, supplying a considerable amount of concrete personal and genealogical material on emigrant families, of which the Risser family was but one interesting example.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

THE MODERN SOCIAL GOSPEL AND THE WAY OF THE CROSS

GUY F. HERSHBERGER*

While righteousness and salvation as proclaimed by the Christian faith have their relationship to eternity, their significance for the present world is no less significant. Jesus Christ calls His disciples to take up their cross and follow Him, meaning that they must live the kind of "cross life" which He lived and of which His "cross death" was but the logical consummation. The cross life as taught in the Sermon on the Mount and throughout the New Testament is so difficult, however, that succeeding generations of Christians continue to re-examine the meaning of the Christian ethic for their time, sometimes apparently in a more or less vain search for a Christian means of evading the way of the cross. The result has been the formulation of many ethical systems so that the history of Christianity itself could be written in terms of its ethical variations, ranging from sects and groups who manifest little or no social concern, relegating righteous living largely to the sphere of eternity, to those which place great emphasis on righteousness as they understand it, in this life here and now. Of the latter type within modern Christendom perhaps none has been a more dynamic social force than has Calvinism. At Geneva it was John Calvin's purpose to establish a holy society, a kingdom of God on earth.

This idea was brought to America by the Puritans and was shared by the Quakers and others who followed them. Seventeenth-

*This article is a section from the 1954 Conrad Grebel Lectures to be published with the title, *The Way of the Cross in Human Relations.*

century American Christianity had a social message. The details of its ethics varied to correspond with the different types of theology represented by the churches; but the fundamental nature of the kingdom as conceived by early American churchmen was the same. It was a kingdom into which men were brought, one by one, by process of personal conversion. Once in the kingdom they lived as disciplined citizens under the sovereignty of God. Says H. Richard Niebuhr: "It was the rule of self-restraint in lives which had become repentant of their evil tendency." [1] This was the tradition of the American churches which continued until the middle of the nineteenth century. The Great Awakenings, from Jonathan Edwards to Charles G. Finney, maintained an interest in Bible study combined with a conviction that the way of life taught in the Scriptures must be manifest in the life of the disciple. "The reign of Christ [was] . . . a rule of the knowledge of God."[2]

The era of Finney in the middle third of the nineteenth century was also the age of the common man, which witnessed the introduction of numerous social reforms, such as antislavery, peace, temperance, prison reform, and others. While it would be unfair to give the evangelists all the credit for these achievements, it is certain that the reforms of the era were in part the fruit of the great revivals. Finney preached judgment upon the sin of slavery and pleaded with slaveholders to repent of their ways in preparation for the wrath to come. He did not preach mere individual salvation. Once men were converted and brought into the kingdom it was their duty to go forth "with all their hearts to search out all evils in the world, and to reform the world, and to drive out iniquity from the earth . . . . Religion is something to do, not something to wait for."[3] Finney was president of Oberlin College, the first coeducational college in America; and the progressive program and reforms associated with this institution are evidence enough that the statement quoted here was no mere set of empty words.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, however, the second Great Awakening had about run its course, and secular forces were slowly but surely gaining control of the American mind. John Calvin had insisted that the businessman must be honest because this is what God requires. In the eighteenth century, however, Benjamin Franklin was approving honesty as the best policy; and in the gilded age following the Civil War it seems that at least some businessmen

1 H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Kingdom of God in America* (New York, 1937), 105.
2 *Ibid.*, 110.
3 Quoted in Liston Pope, "Religion as a Social Force in America," *Social Action* (May, 1953), 8.

were not sure that it was even the best policy. At any rate the exuberant prosperity of the new country with its unbounded opportunities, and a continuous flow of mechanical devices ministering to convenience and comfort, cast such a materialistic spell over the average American that if he thought of the kingdom of God at all he conceived it as a paradise of material delights. Since America was a chosen nation especially favored of God, why look any farther for the kingdom? The idea of progress advanced by the eighteenth-century philosophers was verified by nineteenth-century evolutionary optimism; and if the kingdom was not already here it was rapidly on its way. Judgment and catastrophe were outmoded ideas. Progress was the watchword. Man and human nature were good. There was therefore no need for repentance. Christ the Redeemer had become merely Jesus the teacher. "To be reconciled to God," says H. R. Niebuhr, "now meant to be reconciled to the established customs of a more or less Christianized society." It was a naive optimistic religion: "A God without wrath brought men without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a cross."[4]

This New Theology, as it was called, appealed to refined and wealthy Americans who wanted a religion which would leave them feeling comfortable, their complacency undisturbed, as they worshiped man and his material achievements. "Believe in yourselves and reverence your own human nature," said Phillips Brooks; "it is the only salvation from brutal vice and every false belief."[5] Those who practice this gospel are sure to prosper and need not concern themselves too much about those who are less fortunately situated. True, poverty merits our concern, but "actual suffering for the necessities of life, terrible as it is, is comparatively rare." At any rate, a certain amount of inequality is good; and if we will only let natural harmony have its way, the social problem of the world "will get settled somehow."[6]

The attitude of the Protestant clergy toward wealth and toward their poverty-stricken fellow men in the gilded age seems strange indeed alongside the admonitions of the prophets and the commands of Christ. Henry Ward Beecher, a "prince of the pulpit," was able to brush off the plight of the striking railway workers with the statement that a family unable to live on a dollar a day is not fit to live. At the same time Beecher was noted for his own showmanship and extravagant living. His handsome income from newspaper revenue and other sources besides his ministerial salary enabled him to in-

4 Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, 181, 193.
5 W. S. Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches* (New York, 1953), 164.
6 *Ibid.*, 166.

dulge in fancy horses, and in handfuls of uncut gems which he carried in his pockets. The lack of good taste, not to speak of the distance which the ministry could go in its departure from the way of the cross portrayed in the New Testament, is seen in the following "testimonial" advertisement which carried the heading, "Henry Ward Beecher's Opinion of Pear's Soap."

Cleanliness is next to Godliness. Soap must be considered as a means of *grace* and a clergyman who recommends *moral* things should be willing to recommend soap.

I am told that my recommendation of *Pear's* Soap has opened for it a large sale in the *United States.*

I am willing to *stand by every word in favor of it, I have ever* uttered. A man must be fastidious indeed who is not satisfied with it.[7]

In those days the defense of wealth by the Protestant clergy seems to have been taken for granted. In 1885 Noah Porter, president of Yale, said God has given man the duty to acquire property, and to defend it, once it is his.[8] James McCosh of Princeton said: "God has bestowed upon us certain powers and gifts which no one is at liberty to take from us or to interfere with. All attempts to deprive us of them is theft. Under the same head may be placed all purposes to deprive us of the right to earn property or to use it as we see fit."[9] A widely used textbook on Christian ethics published in 1875 declared: "By proper use of wealth man may greatly elevate and extend his moral work. It is therefore his duty to seek to secure wealth for this high end. . . . The moral governor has placed the power of acquisitiveness in man for a good and noble purpose . . . ."[10] Ralph Gabriel thinks the mood of the American middle class can be measured by the great popularity of Russell H. Conwell's famous lecture, *Acres of Diamonds.* Said Conwell, a Baptist minister of Philadelphia: "To secure wealth is an honorable ambition, and is one great test of a person's usefulness to others." Poverty, on the other hand, is a mark of sin. "To sympathize with a man whom God has punished for his sins, thus to help him when God would still continue punishment, is to do wrong, no doubt about it . . . ."[11] In 1900 Bishop Lawrence of Massachusetts said: "In the long run, it is only to the man of morality that wealth comes . . . . Godliness is in league with riches . . . . Material prosperity is helping to make the national character sweeter, more joyous, more unselfish, more Christlike."[12]

7 Quoted in *ibid.*, 178.
8 Noah Porter, *Elements of Moral Science* (1885), 362, 368, quoted in R. H. Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (1940), 147.
9 James McCosh, *Our Moral Nature* (1892), 40, quoted, *ibid.*, 147.
10 D. S. Gregory, *Christian Ethics* (1875), 224, quoted, *ibid.*, 148.
11 R. H. Conwell, *Acres of Diamonds* (1890), 19, quoted, *ibid.*, 149, and in Marquis W. Childs and Douglass Cater, *Ethics in a Business Society* (A Mentor Book, New York, 1954), 137.
12 Quoted in Gabriel, 149-50.

These views and attitudes were so extreme, however, that they were bound to bring reaction. The industrial revolution and the rapid urbanization which accompanied it were manifesting so many unwholesome features that many Christian leaders began to challenge the thesis of the morality of the rich and the sinfulness of the poor. The sweatshop, child labor, women in industry at starvation wages, and endless processions of men "out of work, out of clothes, out of shoes, and out of hope," caused more than one city pastor to conclude that there was something wrong with a social order which produced such bitter fruit. As a result there emerged a new attitude toward the social order in most of western Christendom, an attitude which has affected Catholicism and all branches of Protestantism, both in Europe and America. While this new point of view expressed itself in various ways, depending on the religious group, the country, and the time, in general it recognized (1) that continuous change in the social order is to be expected; (2) that the church has an obligation to make the Gospel meaningful and effective in this changing society; (3) that the church has a special obligation toward oppressed and neglected classes and races of people.

The most radical expression of this new point of view took the form of what came to be known as the Social Gospel, an American movement which got under way about 1865 and reached its zenith about 1915. While the movement included many sincere and sensitive souls who earnestly sought to make the Christian ethic effective in industrial society, it is unfortunate that the basic theology of the Social Gospel was frequently no different from that of the liberal clergymen who spoke comforting words to the rich and the powerful. The Social Gospel did not think of the church as a colony of heaven within the sinful society as did the Apostle Paul. It was Calvinistic in its approach in that society as a whole was to be governed by Christian principles. It was a departure, however, from original Calvinism, (1) in its optimism which assumed that everything within the social order would readily become Christian; (2) in the method by which the Christianization of the social order was to be achieved.

Central to the Social Gospel was its identification of the kingdom of God with the Christianized social order which Jesus supposedly had come to establish. The kingdom of God was not the church. It was not a holy society bringing judgment on the sinful social order after the manner of Edwards and Finney. At most the church was a fellowship for worship within the kingdom. Jesus was the founder of a new society providing for all human needs, which the law of human progress, undergirded by the newly discovered theory of evolution,

was now surely bringing into fulfillment. The abolition of slavery was not an act of repentance. It was merely one stage in the evolution of the kingdom, after which the next stage would come. "Now that God has smitten slavery unto death," said Edward Beecher at the close of the Civil War, "He has opened the way for the redemption and sanctification of our whole social system."[13] To most of the social gospelers, however, redemption and sanctification meant nothing more revolutionary to the individual than a proclamation of "the glad tidings of progress." "What Christ meant to [Henry Ward] Beecher," says Winthrop S. Hudson, "was never wholly clear."[14] He had much to say about the noble example, the king of love, or the spiritual presence; but an examination of his sermons shows that he had never preached on "the passion and death of Christ upon the cross."[15] Lyman Abbott, Beecher's successor in Plymouth Church, said frankly, "We do not ask what men believe."[16]

Newell Dwight Hillis, Abbott's successor, followed the same line, being assured that

> Better times are coming. Good will is taking the place of hate. Even labor and capital are becoming better friends. Peace is going to succeed war. Wealth is becoming the almoner of universal bounty. Statesmen are trying to right the wrongs of the oppressed . . . . Literature is sharpening arrows against injustice . . . . Never were the libraries filled with wiser books; the press is sowing the land with the good seed of wisdom and knowledge . . . . For centuries the democracy of Jesus has slowly leavened the people, but the time is not far off when with one accord every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.[17]

It is unfortunate, indeed, that a movement which saw so clearly the social implications of the Gospel should have gone so far astray in its theological assumptions. "Happy believers in divine benevolence and human goodness . . .," says Hudson, "the majority of the preachers of the New Theology found it difficult to conceive of a church which did not embrace humanity indiscriminately. . . . They believed that the mission of Christianity was largely accomplished."[18] This being the case, what real need was there for a church? William Newton Clarke's *An Outline of Christian Theology,* leading textbook of the New Theology, did not even include a discussion of the Church; and Hudson says that if the author had been asked about the omission he would likely have replied "that the proper place to

13 Quoted in C. H. Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915* (New Haven, 1940), 9.
14 Quoted in Hudson, *op. cit.*, 172.
15 *Ibid.*, 173.
16 *Ibid.*, 172.
17 *Ibid.*, 179.
18 *Ibid.*, 194.

discuss the Church was in sociology, not theology."[19] If there was no need for the Church, what need was there for Christ the foundation of the Church or for the God who was in Christ?

"For anyone living in the troubled mid-twentieth century," says John A. Hutchinson, "it is hard to comprehend the widespread acceptance of so blandly hopeful a faith a brief fifty years ago."[20] While much was said of social reforms to come, sin was ignored, and the "preliminary pessimism which the great religions of the world have all presupposed as their premise" was repudiated.[21] There was no cross death in the New Testament sense, much less the cross life which is a fruit of the new creation which follows the reconciling work of God who was in Christ. Hudson says: "It was as if God had been 'naturalized' and invited . . . 'to give a weekly editorial commentary' on the vagaries of a society, in the image of which he had been made."[22] Thus it would not be far wrong to say that the theological era prior to the first World War was a kind of fool's paradise in which it was believed that "with the everkindly but often vague help of God, man could make his way by continuous progress into the ideal society which the Social Gospel called the kingdom of God."[23]

While this would seem to be a fair characterization of the movement as a whole, the story would not be complete without special reference to Walter Rauschenbusch, the greatest prophet of the Social Gospel. Rauschenbusch had an understanding of the social implications of the Christian faith beyond that of any of his contemporaries; and those aspects of the Social Gospel which have survived as of permanent value were largely his contribution. In this sense he was the best representative of the era. At the same time he had so much in common with the earlier evangelicals, such as Finney, or perhaps even Edwards, that Winthrop S. Hudson calls him "a lonely Prophet,"[24] atypical of his own age. Paradoxically, this atypical quality is what enabled him to be the best representative of his era and to make his contribution one of permanent value.

Rauschenbusch was born in 1861 and was graduated from seminary in 1886, after which he became pastor of a small German Baptist Church in New York City, where his ministry to the people of the working class, victims of industrialism at its worst in the gilded age, provided the material for the development of his social message. From 1897 to the time of his death in 1918 he was a member of the

19 *Ibid.*, 203.
20 John A. Hutchinson, *Christian Faith and Social Action* (New York, 1953), 10.
21 W. L. Sperry, quoted in Hudson, *op. cit.*, 194.
22 Hudson, 194.
23 Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, 10.
24 Hudson, *op. cit.*, 226.

faculty of Rochester Theological Seminary, where his father had taught before him. In the midst of his ministerial and professional duties he found time for several interludes of study and travel in Europe, which also made their contribution to the development of his concept of social Christianity. Rauschenbusch was influenced by the writings of Henry George, whose *Progress and Poverty* was published in 1879. While traveling in England he was much impressed by the co-operative movement in that country. He also followed the economic thought of Richard T. Ely and Franklin H. Giddings. Being greatly influenced by socialism he became a severe critic of the capitalist system, especially as expressed in the monopolistic corporations of the time, which he described as "an unregenerate part of the social order, not based on freedom, love, and mutual service, as they are, but on autocracy, antagonism of interests and exploitation."[25] He called for a new economic order characterized by social justice, collective property right, industrial democracy, approximate equality, and co-operation. Specifically, he proposed measures to limit the hours of labor, to increase wages, to protect the worker against accident and disease, to provide better housing, and to improve the care of the aged. Before this could be accomplished, however, he believed it necessary to socialize such natural resources as coal and iron and to convert all natural monopolies into public property. "My whole desire has been," he said, "to summon the Christian passion for justice and the Christian powers of love and mercy to do their share in redeeming our social order from its inherent wrongs."[26]

Rauschenbusch lived in the era when the theologies of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Harnack were making their greatest impact. He was born two years after the publication of the *Origin of Species;* and when he began his ministry Herbert Spencer was at the height of his influence. Rauschenbusch was too much a child of his age not to be deeply influenced by these forces. Thus it is that nowhere in his writings can one find a clear commitment to the doctrine of the deity of Christ, or of the incarnation as taught in the Pauline writings. There is no question that Rauschenbusch recognized the existence of sin and a kingdom of evil, but he was content to leave Satan as a figure of speech; and he referred to the "blessed skepticism of the age of Enlightenment and the dawn of modern science which saved humanity from the furies of a theology which had gone wrong."[27] While much is said about the need of redemption from sin, both personal and social, the writings of Rauschenbusch treat the atonement

25 Quoted in Hopkins, 223.
26 *Ibid.*, 215.
27 Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (New York, 1917), 83-86.

and the resurrection of Christ, and the meaning of His life and death, in such a manner as to leave with a deeply unsatisfied feeling those who find in the Gospel message *the way of the cross* in human relations. When he denounces the hypocrisy of the orthodox churchman who amasses a fortune at the expense of his fellow men, he strikes a chord to which we respond with gladness and sympathy; but when he refers to heresy as a lesser evil,[28] a sinking feeling comes to one's heart, especially if the heresy has to do with the person and work of Christ which is the source of power for the way of the cross.

On the other hand, Rauschenbusch did not share the naive optimism of his contemporaries. He was more like a prophet warning America of impending doom unless there is repentance from the collective sins of the nation.

> The continents are strewn with the ruins of dead nations and civilizations. History laughs at the optimistic illusion that "nothing can stand in the way of human progress." It would be safer to assert that progress is always for a time only, and then succumbs to the inevitable decay. One by one the ancient peoples rose to wealth and civilization . . . and then began to decay within and to crumble away. . . . What guarantee have we, then, that our modern civilization with its pomp will not be "one with Nineveh and Tyre"? . . .
>
> Will some Gibbon of Mongol race sit by the shore of the Pacific in the year 3000 A.D. and write on the "Decline and Fall of the Christian Empire"? If so, he will probably describe the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as the golden age when outwardly life flourished as never before, but when that decay, which resulted in the gradual collapse of the twenty-first and twenty-second centuries, was already far advanced.
>
> Or will the twentieth century mark for the future historian the real adolescence of humanity, the great emancipation from barbarism and from the paralysis of injustice, and the beginning of a progress in the intellectual, social, and moral life of mankind to which our past history has no parallel?
>
> It will depend almost wholly on the moral forces which the nations can bring to the fighting line against wrong, and the fighting energy of those moral forces will again depend on the degree to which they are inspired by religious faith and enthusiasm. It is either a revival of social religion or the deluge.[29]

These words were written seven years before the first World War; and when that holocaust finally came Rauschenbusch was not at all sure that these gloomy words were not in process of fulfillment. He was not swept away by the lighthearted thought that this was a Christian crusade for the ending of all wars.

Rauschenbusch believed that the cause of national decay is sin, and that sin consists primarily of selfishness and injustice. In a day when others were making light of the idea of sin he declared his own belief in "original sin." True, he did not seem to be sure whether

28 *Ibid.*, 53-54.
29 W. Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis* (New York, 1907), 279-86.

original sin stemmed from Adam's fall or from man's untamed animal nature. He was sure, however, that something was wrong with man and that this wrong was being transmitted from generation to generation, both biologically and by social transmission in the customs and institutions of society.[30] His writings are devoted to a call to repentance from sin and a turning to salvation. He recognized

> . . . the sinfulness of every human heart . . . and power of God to save every soul that comes to Him. . . . Salvation of the individual is . . . an essential part of salvation. Every new being is a new problem of salvation. It is always a great and wonderful thing when a young spirit enters into voluntary obedience to God and feels the higher freedom with which Christ makes us free. It is one of the miracles of life.[31]

The great emphasis of Rauschenbusch's teaching, however, was that the concept of salvation must be enlarged. If the social order is sinful, then this must also be saved and redeemed; thus he had much to say of "social salvation." Many of his statements concerning social salvation appear to be an exposition of the way of the cross in social relations as set forth in the New Testament. He recognizes nonresistance as an essential part of Christ's teaching and of His conception of life.[32] Frequently he seems to approach the Anabaptist view of the social order, calling for a colony of heaven, a society of the redeemed, who make the way of the cross effective in all their human relations. Indeed, Rauschenbusch seems to have been deeply influenced by the Anabaptists. "While the great churches were bitterly contending" over the nature of the Lord's Supper, he says, "the persecuted Anabaptists, who had neither the right to meet nor to exist, . . . returned to the original spirit of the Lord's Meal and realized that Real Presence about which others wrangled."[33] He recognized this Real Presence among them as the power which gave the Anabaptist communities their prophetic quality, making them forerunners of the modern world, standing "against war, against capital punishment, against slavery, and against coercion in matters of religion before others thought of it."[34]

The following statement of "social salvation" reads almost like a nineteenth-century version of the sixteenth-century Anabaptist doctrine.

> If sin is selfishness, salvation must be a change which turns a man from self to God and humanity . . . . Complete salvation, therefore, would consist in an attitude of love in which he would freely co-ordinate his life with the life of his fellows in obedience to the living impulses of the spirit

30 Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, 57-72.
31 *Ibid.*, 5, 95.
32 *Ibid.*, 263.
33 *Ibid.*, 205-6.
34 *Ibid.*, 195-6.

of God, thus taking his part in a divine organism of mutual service. When a man is in a state of sin, he may be willing to harm the life and lower the self-respect of a woman for the sake of his desires; he may be willing to take some of the mental and spiritual values out of the life of thousands of families, and lower the human level of a whole mill-town in order to increase his own dividend or maintain his autocratic sense of power. If this man comes under the influence of the mind of Christ, he would see men and women as children of God with divine worth and beauty, and this realization would cool his lust or covetousness. Living now in the consciousness of the pervading spiritual life of God, he would realize that all his gifts and resources are a loan of God for higher ends, and would do his work with greater simplicity of mind and brotherliness.[35]

When Rauschenbusch says that the experience of Moses at the burning bush led him to the social task of delivering his people from bondage and when he says that Isaiah and Jeremiah were used of God to bring the way of salvation to their nation we readily give our assent. But when he speaks of social institutions as "lost" and "saved" one is compelled to raise a question.

> Super-personal forces are saved when they come under the law of Christ . . . . A state which deals with those who have erred in the way of teaching, discipline, and restoration, has come under the law of Christ and is to that extent a saved community . . . . A change in penology may be an evidence of salvation . . . . The fundamental step of repentance and conversion for professions and organizations is to give up monopoly power and the incomes derived from legalized extortion, and to come under the law of service, content with a fair income for honest work. The corresponding step in the case of governments and political oligarchies, both in monarchies and in capitalistic semi-democracies, is to submit to real democracy. Thereby they step out of the Kingdom of Evil into the Kingdom of God.[36]

According to the New Testament the kingdom of God is a brotherhood of individuals who have renounced the sinful world, and who have experienced individual salvation through faith in Christ. It is to this brotherhood of saved individuals that Jesus spoke the Sermon on the Mount and the doctrine of nonresistance. If a community is Christian it is because its members are Christian and follow the way of the cross in their social relations. Many of the social gospelers ignored the need for personal regeneration altogether, and devoted their energies entirely to the reconstruction of the social order, the community, the city and the state, and the international world. Since evil is the result of an unfavorable environment, they would change the environment, making it difficult to do evil, so that everyone would be a Christian as a matter of course. Evangelism in the New Testament sense was ignored, the church becoming an agency for social reform, believing that when co-operatives, democracies, and

35 *Ibid.*, 97-98.
36 *Ibid.*, 113, 117.

decent housing had replaced private enterprise, monarchies, and slums, the kingdom of God would have arrived.

To be fair to Rauschenbusch, however, it must be said that he did not go as far in this direction as some of the lesser social gospelers did. His understanding of sin was too deep to permit its dismissal as a mere environmental influence. His program for the Christianization of the social order included individual repentance from wrong attitudes and practices, and an entrance of the individual into a life of obedience to God. "The greatest contribution which any man can make to the social movement is the contribution of a regenerated personality . . . . The fundamental contribution of every man is the change of his own personality."[37] One cannot dispel the feeling, however, that his gospel of social salvation was vitiated in the first place by a low view of Christ, of the incarnation, and of the atonement. A man completely surrendered to the will of God can indeed be a great prophet and a mighty leader in the work of the kingdom. Our historic faith tells us, however, that Jesus was more than a man, yes, more than a prophet with a message from God. He was God Himself, speaking with authority from heaven; and every creative age of the church has been characterized by a deep consciousness of this great truth. The theology of Rauschenbusch, however, is lacking in this dimension.

In the second place, one cannot escape the feeling that in Rauschenbusch's scale of values God and the divine are given too low a rating while that given to man is relatively too high. After all, Jesus said the first and great commandment is to love God, while love for one's fellow men comes second, and "is like it."[38] Rauschenbusch says, however, that "To love men . . . is an avenue to the living experience of God,"[39] and cites Biblical teaching to support his view: "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"[40] The fact is, of course, that these two commands are inextricably intertwined so that one cannot keep the one without keeping the other also; and the nontheological mind might be excused if it does not fully succeed in placing them in proper order. It must not be forgotten, however, that in Biblical teaching the Christian's union with God is brought about as a result of the divine initiative in the first instance. It is the love of God as expressed in the self-emptying act of Jesus Christ which comes down and draws all men unto Himself, and makes them capable of loving their fel-

37 Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, 351, 412.
38 Matt. 22:37-39.
39 Rauschenbusch, *A Gospel for the Social Awakening* (Edited by Benjamin E. Mays, New York, 1950), 125.
40 I John 4:20 (AV).

lows. It is not man's search through devious mountain paths, not even the noble path of human love, that leads him upward to the reality of God. Hence Rauschenbusch's statement, even though it contains an element of truth, does not ring quite true when he says:

> It is by loving men that we enter into a living love for God. Social work may be a gateway to conscious religion . . . . There may be other paths that lead to Him, such as the solitary search for truth, or the lonely way of Mystic contemplation. But love is the surest way with fewest pitfalls. . . .[41]

In the third place, despite his acceptance of personal regeneration and the rejection of the naive optimism of his contemporaries, the frame of reference for Rauschenbusch's kingdom of God was the general social order itself, rather than the New Testament colony of heaven. The emphasis was on a redeemed society rather than on a society of redeemed men, and the difference between these two concepts is a real one. Here again there is so much truth to what Rauschenbusch says that in laying the finger on his error one must needs take care lest he throw out the baby with the bath; or to use a Biblical figure, lest he pull up the wheat with the tares. When Christ told His disciples, "Ye are the salt of the earth," He did give expression to "a great historic mission to the whole of humanity."[42] Truly the Christian Church is the salt of the earth, the conscience of society, or whatever figure we may choose to express the idea. Surely the moral and ethical impact which Christianity has made upon western civilization has been nothing short of marvelous. Alongside of our vaunted material progress, the value of which is in many ways questionable, there has been genuine moral progress, especially in the area of social ethics. And there can be no doubt that this is largely the fruit of the Christian witness and its impact upon society as a whole. Were it not for the Church and its influence the character of our sinful social order and of western civilization would be far less desirable than it is at present.

There is so much truth to this that the following outburst of Rauschenbusch is understandable:

> If at this juncture we can rally sufficient religious faith and moral strength to snap the bonds of evil and turn the present unparalleled economic and intellectual resources of humanity to the harmonious development of a true social life, the generations yet unborn will mark this as that great day of the Lord for which the ages waited, and count us blessed for sharing in the apostolate that proclaimed it.[43]

Had Rauschenbusch's Christology and his eschatology been more Biblical, however, this statement would have been tempered

41 *A Gospel for the Social Awakening*, 124.
42 *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, 415, 416.
43 *Ibid.*, 422.

and the author's vision more realistic. This dream, he says, "is not one tenth as hopeless" today as it was at the time when Jesus first announced it. "Under the circumstances at that time it was an utterance of the most daring faith—faith in himself, faith in them, faith in what he was putting into them, faith in faith."[44] Indeed, if Jesus was only a "Nazarene carpenter speaking to a group of Galilaean peasants and fishermen,"[45] this was a daring venture. And if what has occurred in Christian history these 1900 years is but a religious version of evolution, Jesus and His kingdom are on a lower level by far than the triumphant Church of Jesus Christ portrayed in the New Testament. Evolution, says Rauschenbusch, "has prepared us for understanding the idea of a Reign of God toward which all creation is moving. Translate the evolutionary theories into religious faith, and you have the doctrine of the kingdom of God."[46] In the final analysis this view puts the whole kingdom idea on the human level, although admittedly God is back of it. And if this is true, then Jesus had more faith in Himself and His followers than our understanding of human nature would warrant.

Happily, however, Jesus was more than an inspired prophet with faith in himself and his followers. He was the incarnate Son of God who had emptied Himself of His heavenly prerogatives to demonstrate the way of love and the cross in His life and in His death, in order that there might be one in whom men could have faith. He did not have faith in Himself. He was the Faithful One with authority not only to teach the way of the cross, but with power to create born-again saints equipped to follow the way of the cross. It is this community of saints in subjection to the lordship of Christ which constitutes the kingdom of God. It is this kingdom which is the salt of the earth, the conscience of society, of the state, and of the social order. To the extent that men have come under the rule of the kingdom and in their ethics have accepted the way of the cross, to that extent the social order has been and will continue to be Christianized. Until Satan and his hosts have been destroyed, however, and sin rooted out of the earth, the general social order and the kingdom of God cannot be identical.

The eschatology of Rauschenbusch, however, required the identification of the kingdom and the social order, here and now. The millennial hope must be restored to Christian theology, but it is a hope based on development, not upon catastrophe.

The future development of the race should have a larger place in

44 *Ibid.*, 415.
45 *Ibid.*, 415.
46 W. Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York, 1912), 90.

practical Christian teaching . . . . As to the way in which the Christian ideal of society is to come,—we must shift from catastrophe to development . . . . An eschatology which is expressed in terms of historic development has no final consummation. Its consummations are always the basis for further development.[47]

Here again, there is much truth to what he says. The kingdom of God has experienced a continuous development; and until, and even following, the *Parousia* it will no doubt continue to do so. Rauschenbusch's rejection of naive optimism also gives a warning that the development of the kingdom does not take place without conflict and disappointment. "At best there is always but an approximation to a perfect social order. The kingdom of God is always but coming."[48]

Even though this theology of development is cautiously stated, it is nevertheless carried so far that it eliminates the Biblical doctrine of the *Parousia* and of the Last Judgment. Indeed, if there was no Christ who came from heaven and returned to heaven, how could He come again in the *Parousia?* The evolution of a naturalistic kingdom cannot be disturbed by such supernaturalistic intervention. And yet, even Rauschenbusch's eschatology warns us of an end to the earthly phase of his kingdom through the natural process of age and decay. "Our race will come to an end in due time; the astronomical clock is already ticking which will ring in the end."[49] This, it seems, would be catastrophe enough, even though realized only by degrees. As between this "hope" of a slow but sure demise through naturalistic processes and the hope of the glorious appearing of the King Himself finally to bring all things under His lordship and to establish the kingdom in its fullness, the latter scheme would seem not only to have New Testament theology on its side, but a satisfying sense of well-founded Christian optimism as well.

In many ways Rauschenbusch seems to be very close to the way of the cross in his social ethics. He refers to the nonresistance of Jesus.[50] He speaks of the cross: "Let the Church of Christ fling in, not the sword, but the cross, not against the weak, but for them!"[51] Salvation, he says, brings men together as the children of one Father, whereas sin divides men "in war and hate, in pride and lies, in injustice and greed."[52] Again, he says: "The sense of equality is the only basis for Christian morality";[53] the Christian will regard all men as equals before God be they black or white.[54] He recognizes that Jesus

47 *A Theology for the Social Gospel,* 223-27.
48 *Christianity and the Social Crisis,* 421.
49 *A Theology for the Social Gospel,* 227.
50 *Ibid.,* 263.
51 *Christianizing the Social Order,* 39.
52 *Ibid,* 327.
53 *Christianity and the Social Crisis,* 247.
54 W. Rauschenbusch, *The Social Principles of Jesus,* 27-28, 33, 38-39.

had superseded the customary ethics of Judaism in His insistence that the moral law of God must be fulfilled.[55] He has a keen insight into the collective sins of our society, pointing out how organizations formed for a good purpose

> drift into evil under sinister leadership, or under the pressure of need or temptation .... A trade union fights for the right to organize a shop, but resorts to violence and terrorizing; a trust, desiring to steady prices and get away from antiquated competition, undersells the independents and evades or purchases legislation. This tendency to deterioration shows the soundness of the social instincts, but also the ease with which they go astray, and the need of righteous social institutions to prevent temptation.[56]

As mentioned above,[57] Rauschenbusch was greatly impressed by the extent to which the Anabaptists had achieved a holy society with righteous social institutions, which had succeeded in conquering these collective sins within their own brotherhood. In spite of the fundamental difference between Anabaptism and the modern Social Gospel, in their conception of the kingdom of God and its relation to the social order, Rauschenbusch admits that it is only sectarian groups such as they that have succeeded in making the principles of the kingdom effective in their way of life:

> The platform for ethical progress laid down in the Sermon on the Mount is a great platform .... Yet its fate is tragic .... Only small sections of the Christian Church have taken the sayings on oaths, nonresistance, and love of enemies to mean what they say and to be obligatory.[58]
>
> Only those church bodies which have been in opposition to organized society and have looked for a better city with its foundations in heaven have taken the Sermon on the Mount seriously.[59]

Rauschenbusch was so near to the way of the cross and yet so far from it. There were conflicting elements in his thinking on the nature of the kingdom which was the heart of his theology. From one point of view he stands in the tradition of the pietists and even of the earlier American evangelicals with their emphasis on a holy society of men born into the kingdom through the supernatural experience of regeneration. From another viewpoint he was the heir of the Anabaptist tradition which interpreted the kingdom as a holy society of redeemed men and women who took upon themselves the way of discipleship, in obedience to the Sermon on the Mount and the way of the cross.[60] From yet another point of view, however, he

55 *Ibid.*, 89.
56 *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, 72.
57 See p. 92.
58 *The Social Principles of Jesus*, 89-90.
59 *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, 133-38.
60 Rauschenbusch was a student of Anabaptist history; he was in communication with John Horsch, the Mennonite historian; and he published an early article, "The Zürich Anabaptists

was also the child of his own naturalistic age to such an extent that in many ways the foundations of these two great traditions were destroyed.

Despite his personal loyalty to the Sermon on the Mount which was given to men whom Christ had called out of the world, and which Rauschenbusch says has been taken seriously only by those who have stood in opposition to the social order, his own frame of reference was still the general social order; the admittedly sinful social order and the kingdom were identical. Despite all that he said about regeneration and the miraculous character of the kingdom, he nevertheless virtually identified the coming of the kingdom with the process of natural evolution. Even though he warned against a naive optimism, and had much to say about the sinful nature of the social order, the evolutionary philosophy which he endorsed virtually required the inevitability of progress so that the inability of his contemporaries to take his words of caution seriously is not surprising.

Finally, despite his emphasis on the Sermon on the Mount, on love, and even at times on the cross, his concern for the achievement of social justice was nevertheless so great that in the final analysis the demand for justice stands out in sharper relief in his writings than does the doing of justice. Jesus consciously cast His lot with the common people and the poor, says Rauschenbusch:

> He gave them a faith, a hope of better days, and a sense that God was on their side . . . . He saw them over against "the rich" . . . took sides with the group of toil. He stood up for them. He stood with them. We cannot help seeing Him with His arm thrown in protection about the poor man, and His other hand raised in warning against the rich . . . . It seems hard to escape the conclusion that Jesus was not impartial between the two.[61]

Great as the element of truth in this statement may be, and severe as Jesus' denunciation of the selfish rich certainly was, there is yet another dimension which Rauschenbusch overlooks. This is the dimension of nonresistance, of self-emptying, of the suffering of injustice rather than to violate the law of love. In short, the dimension which is missing is the cross life of Christ which led to His death on Calvary and which constitutes the pattern of life for His disciples today. With this all-important dimension missing the ethic of the kingdom is watered down so that ultimately the demand for justice takes precedence over the doing of justice; Christian nonresistance becomes Gandhian nonviolent resistance; and the way of the cross

and Thomas Müntzer," in which he includes Conrad Grebel's well-known letter of Sept. 5, 1524, to Müntzer, upholding the way of love, nonresistance, and the cross. The article appeared in *The American Journal of Theology* (January, 1905), 9:91-105.

61 *The Social Principles of Jesus,* 39-40.

becomes the class struggle. The divergence between Rauschenbusch and the way of the cross seems inconspicuous, and at times it is almost indiscernible. It is certainly not as great as the divergence between the way of the cross and the preaching of many of his contemporaries; but even so the ultimate result is two roads leading in radically different directions.

We return now to the Social Gospel as a whole to observe some further developments, particularly its later history. Although there was much pacifism within the movement, it was a type of pacifism which looked for the elimination of war through the operation of the law of progress and the Christianization of the social order. As a rule it did not produce conscientious objectors who took their stand for the law of Christ and the way of the cross in the face of a society given to militarism. When the war came in 1914 many of the Social Gospel pacifists were caught off guard since they were not expecting a major war to occur. They recovered their composure, however, when they were assured that this was the war which would end wars. Since it was merely one of those obstacles which the pilgrim on the progress road inevitably encounters, the best must be made of it. This point of view made it relatively easy for men like Newell Dwight Hillis and Harry Emerson Fosdick to support the war, and it helps to explain why many churchmen of the Social Gospel school virtually turned their pulpits into recruiting stations for the army.

Rauschenbusch himself died in 1918, at the age of 57. It is impossible to say what his final course would have been had he lived another fifteen years. We know, however, that during the war itself he was not overcome by the hysteria of the time. We also know that the disillusionment which followed the war, when it was discovered that the great crusade had not ended war as it was supposed to do, made for a generally better record on the part of the clergy and the churches during the second World War. Some who remained pacifists now became real conscientious objectors, as in the case of Fosdick. Others who finally rejected pacifism, as in the case of Reinhold Niebuhr, did so with a sobered theological outlook which at least enabled them to recognize war as the sin which it is instead of calling it a fulfillment of the Sermon on the Mount as some had done in 1918. Neo-orthodox theologians have been very critical of Social Gospel pacifism, regarding it as shallow in its outlook, failing to understand both the towering heights of New Testament love and the abysmal depths of human evil. Especially have they charged it with watering down Christ's law of love to a mere nonviolence, oblivious to the fact that nonviolent coercion is capable of being filled

with evils as insidious as violence. Whereas Ambrose and Augustine justified participation in war for the defense of the neighbor and denied the right of self-defense, modern pacifism frequently does the exact opposite, denying the right to participate in war for the defense of the nation, while justifying litigation or other forms of nonviolent coercion for purposes of self-defense. The Augustinian position, say the Neo-orthodox theologians of the Christian Action school, is an unselfish one, and therefore Christian, whereas certain forms of modern pacifism are essentially unchristian, for two reasons: (1) self-defense means a pursuit of self-interest, rather than a concern for the neighbor; and (2) refusal to participate in warfare for the national defense may be grounded on a horror for violence and bloodshed, which may also indicate a stronger love for oneself than for the neighbor. At any rate, they say, such a view has more in common with Indian religious ethics than with the Sermon on the Mount. In this they are no doubt correct.[62]

The Christian Action school has also charged Social Gospel pacifism with a lack of realism in race and industrial relations: It assumed that capital and labor, or black and white, in a sub-Christian social order would love each other sufficiently to obviate the use of force for the realization of justice. In apparently giving unrestricted endorsement to the cause of organized labor, the Social Gospel was certainly throwing its support to the underdog who was at that time the greatest sufferer of injustice in our industrial society. In doing so, however, it was condemning injustice on the part of industrial management without at the same time showing forth the way of the cross as the Christian way for both management and labor.

In an evaluation of the movement it must also be recognized that the Social Gospel came far short of accomplishing all that it had set out to do. Liston Pope says the movement

> was largely middle class in character, urban in setting, and almost exclusively clerical in leadership. It never made really successful contact with the labor movement or with any large segment of the population other than middle-class liberals. It relied principally on preaching, educational methods, discussion groups, and fugitive publications to transform a society headed increasingly toward power conflicts and mass upheavals.[63]

The Social Gospel did, nonetheless, make a lasting impression. Churches were awakened to new ethical responsibilities; seminaries were led to revise their curricula; and the movement gave support to secular reform movements of various kinds. Moreover, most of the larger denominations had recognized the social implications of the

62 See Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics* (New York, 1950), 182-83.
63 Liston Pope, *loc. cit.*, 12.

BERKELEY BAPT

Gospel by appointing official social service agencies or social action commissions. The first such agency of importance was the Department of Church and Labor of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. In 1903 Charles Stelzle, a native of New York's East Side, became superintendent of this department. Stelzle had worked for eight years as a machinist, then studied at Moody Bible Institute, after which he held successful pastorates in working-class congregations in several of the larger cities. In 1910 he organized the Labor Temple in New York City.

Following the organization of the Federal Council of Churches in 1908 that body appointed a Commission on the Church and Social Service, which concerned itself with the problems of the workingman and other social concerns of the church. Four years later the report of the commission called upon the churches to take their stand for humanitarian measures and reforms, such as the abolition of child labor; regulations for the safeguarding of the health of working women; the protection of society from evils of the liquor traffic; and provision for the old age of workers and for those incapacitated by injury. The report called for a new emphasis on the application of Christian principles to the acquisition and use of property, and for other reforms. The principles of this report were widely adopted by Protestant denominations and were not modified by the Federal Council until 1932.

By the time that the Social Gospel cause was taken over by the denominations and the Federal Council, the Social Gospel movement as such had about run its course. Rauschenbusch died during the last year of the war. Then after the war the movement began to break up, its leaders going in divergent directions, although the tradition was continued by Bishop McConnell, Charles Clayton Morrison of the *Christian Century,* and others. A few of the former social gospelers went so far to the left as, for all practical purposes, to exchange their religious faith for that of communism. Some gave up the ministry to enter the professional field of sociology. Others enlisted their energies in specialized types of social reform, such as pacifism, socialism, or prohibition. Some, like Reinhold Niebuhr, while retaining their social passion, gave it a more conservative direction and became leaders in the new theological movement known as Neo-orthodoxy. Others, like J. B. Matthews and Stanley High, moved even farther to the right socially and repudiated completely their former position.[64]

The school of thought in higher theological circles in America

64 *Ibid.,* 10-11.

today which more than any other stands in the succession of the Social Gospel is Neo-orthodoxy, or more exactly perhaps, the Social Action wing of Neo-orthodoxy as a whole. This movement has sloughed off the old optimism based on the idea of progress and the natural goodness of man; it has moved to the theological right far enough to recover an orthodox anthropology and a doctrine of sin; but it is lacking in Christology and soteriology, and in a doctrine of the church and of the Holy Spirit. Like the devotees of the Social Gospel, Social Action has identified itself with the general social order, and all of its thinking is with this orientation. The difference is that whereas the Social Gospel would transform the nearly sinless kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of God with such ease that the help of God was barely needed in the process, its succession is so involved in the ambiguities of the hopelessly sinful social order that even God Himself is not powerful enough to enable a penitent soul to do more than to confess his sin and then keep on sinning.

THE DEPENDENCE OF THE FIRST ANABAPTISTS ON LUTHER, ERASMUS, AND ZWINGLI

Heinold Fast*

The relationship between the Reformation and Anabaptism can be investigated from two angles. On the one hand, it is possible to focus the attention only on the positive connections between the two, especially on the question of the dependence of the Anabaptist movement on the Reformation in general. On the other hand, an attempt can be made to work out the differences in the theological positions and thus to create a clear picture of the basic issues underlying the relationship. Working out the various points of view is, of course, the really interesting question in the historical consideration of the theological currents during the Reformation period. But the other approach, the inquiry into the fundamental or incidental points in common between the divergent wings, must not be forgotten. Indeed, this approach seeks to clarify the common path taken by both groups until the parting, and the more exactly this path is defined the more certainly will the point be found where the separation ensued. Here this first step, so far as this is possible in a brief discussion, is to be taken. The discussion will not center around the differences, even though these differences are already perceptible immediately behind the often only superficially common theological formulas. The only theme is the question of the general or special dependence of the Anabaptists on the three great stars in the Reformation sky. The question of the point where the ways parted will be asked only at the very conclusion, and only where it is historically relevant, i.e., after the comparison of the Anabaptists with their theological teacher Zwingli.

A further limitation results from restricting the subject to the year 1525. I understand this as a limitation of the statement of the problem to the movement at Zürich and that Swiss Anabaptism immediately dependent on Zürich. For previous to the formation of an independent congregation under the sign of adult baptism in Zürich in 1524-25 there was no Anabaptism as such, and the total Anabaptist movement of the following years cannot be imagined without the impetus emanating from the first Swiss Brethren who were expelled from Zürich and continued to be everywhere persecuted. Ideas and ideals issuing from other sources cannot be found before 1526 (Denk

*A paper read by Heinold Fast of Emden, Germany, at a meeting of the *Mennonitischer Geschichtsverein* at Göttingen, Germany, on Aug. 8, 1955, somewhat expanded here. Translated from the German.

and Hut). Thus both in significance and in time Zürich stands at the beginning, and the limitation of the subject to the Anabaptist movement of that city naturally follows.[1]

I shall first consider Luther, for it was Luther who not only brought the Reformation to the point of precipitation, but who also produced the ideas lying at its basis. If we then want to investigate whether and in what way Anabaptism has its position in the general Reformation movement, we must picture for ourselves the nature of the dependence upon Luther, if indeed there is a dependence. At any rate there is such a dependence if one considers the general situation. I shall briefly enumerate seven points in which it is possible to establish such common points between Luther and the Anabaptists, so that we are compelled to say that in this general sense the Anabaptists were children of the Reformation movement determined by Luther.

In the first place, the central concern of Anabaptism was probably to call men to repentance, and indeed to a radical repentance which completely changes the life and leads it along a new path. The Christian life was to be taken very seriously. Anyone who glances into the *Täuferakten* volume on Zürich is impressed by this fact.[2] If we add to this the theme that moved Luther when he wrote the 95 theses which precipitated the Reformation this connection becomes very clear. In the first statement, which may be considered the title of the whole 95 theses, Luther says: The penitence to which Christ has called us is to affect our entire life.[3] Not by means of single good deeds and works, not by following an ecclesiastical ceremony of penitence, but by a conversion of the heart are we obedient to God; this is the thesis of Luther as well as of the Anabaptists.[4]

In the second place, this radical repentance is neither for Luther nor the Anabaptists a work that we human beings can perform of ourselves. Such repentance can be accomplished only as a gift of God. And God has already taken the decisive step for this by speaking to us through Christ. Not until we face the wounds of Christ, in which God has revealed His love to us, is true repentance on our part possible.[5] Professor Blanke, in his essay on the first Anabaptist congregation in Zollikon in 1525,[6] has shown that precisely this idea was

1 The evaluation of the dependence of the Anabaptists on Luther, for instance, would have a different outcome if considered for an area outside the sphere of Zwingli's influence, such as Austria.

2 L. von Muralt and W. Schmid, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz, I: Zürich* (Zürich, 1952); cf., e.g., No. 31, pp. 40 ff.

3 Dominus et magister noster Jesus Christus dicendo Penitentiam agite, etc., omnem vitam fidelium penitentiam esse voluit, *Weimar Ausgabe* (hereafter *WA*), 1:530 ff.

4 E. Hirsch, "Zum Verständnis Schwenckfelds," in *Festgabe für Karl Müller* (Tübingen, 1912), 145 ff., has proved that Schwenckfeld, following Luther, also begins at this point in his thinking.

5 *WA*, 1:525 (*Resolutiones*, letter of dedication).

6 Fritz Blanke, "The First Anabaptist Congregation: Zollikon, 1525," MQR (January, 1953),

alive among the Anabaptists: the first step to repentance is a recognition of sin. But this very step is not ours; it is one that we must ask of God; and indeed in the faith that God "has redeemed us with His rose-colored blood."[7] It is not a matter of *earning* forgiveness by this radical repentance; repentance is solely our response to the forgiveness of sins which has already taken place in Christ.

In the third place we must put the significant place occupied by the Holy Spirit in both Luther and the Anabaptists. It has become customary to say that the Anabaptists had a somewhat extreme view of the working of the Holy Spirit, whereas Luther opposed the free working of the Spirit with an all too rigid view of the church's functions.[8] To be sure, there were in certain Anabaptist circles some deviations which they defended by ascribing them to the Holy Spirit's leading. But what we hear from the Anabaptists in Switzerland in 1525 does not exceed what Luther said, for instance, in his Address to the German Nobles: "Doctors of art, medicine, law, theology—these can be created by the Pope, by the Emperor, and by the universities. But be sure a doctor of the Holy Scriptures can be created only by the Holy Spirit in heaven, as Christ said in John 6: 'They must all be taught by God.' "[9] This was aimed at the exclusive claims of the Roman hierarchy.[10] With words slightly different, and with probably the same verse in mind, the Anabaptists in 1525 and later established their right to appear as preachers of the Gospel without being called by the established church.[11]

In the fourth place, this connecting of repentance directly with the Holy Spirit, which becomes effective through faith in Christ, gave rise among the Anabaptists and with Luther to the concept of liberty of conscience. Thus through Luther the concept of faith experienced a deepening that cannot be overestimated. For Luther faith is something entirely personal, which cannot be removed from us by any one, neither by the state, by the church, nor by any other persons.[12]

27:17-33; also in his *Brüder in Christo: Die Geschichte der ältesten Täufergemeinde (Zollikon 1525)* (Zürich, 1955), 22 ff.

7 Von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.*, 43, 13.

8 I make the antithesis here deliberately between Spirit and office (Geist und Amt), but not between Spirit and Word or Scripture. The antithesis between Spirit and Word is not found among the Zürich Anabaptists.

9 *WA*, 6:460.

10 See Luther's exposition of the idea of the priesthood of all believers; e.g. *WA*, 6:408. Also *WA*, 11:414 (That a Christian Gathering or Congregation Has the Right and the Power . . . , 1523): Only he may preach who is properly called by the congregation. But in an emergency it is allowable "that any one may not only procure a preacher, either by request or by the power of temporal authority, but shall also himself . . . lay hold, stand up, and preach if he can, for need is need and has no rules, just as everyone should run in and lay hold if there is a fire in the city, and should not wait until someone begs him to go."

11 E.g., von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.*, 98, 24: "er könne es nüt zusagen, von sollichen predgen zestan, dann er nit wüsse, was got durch in würken wölle." For an express basing upon the Spirit see *ibid.*, 43, 23 ff. The most extreme cases are acts of Blaurock (*op. cit.*, 39, 110). Notice Blaurock's comment, "sin himelischer vatter habe in gen Zolliken gesant, dieselben sine schaff zu versehen, etc." (*Ibid.*, 126, 12.)

12 *WA*, 9:264 (*Von weltlicher Obrigkeit*, 1523): ". . . so ligt eym iglichen seyne eygen fahr

On the other hand, no one can be *compelled* to believe an idea,[13] which Luther firmly held not only in his earlier years, but also later when he sponsored governmental intervention against heretics.[14] The complete agreement of the Anabaptists with this idea scarcely needs to be mentioned.[15]

In the fifth place, this fact had some consequences in regard to the concept of the two sacraments which were still valid for Luther. For both baptism and communion faith is necessary. When a baptism is performed or when communion is distributed without faith, neither is of any value. Particularly in Luther's writings in the early years of the Reformation does this come to variform expression. At one time he says: "Baptism justifies no one and benefits no one; only faith in the word of promise (to which baptism is [only] added) justifies. Faith is in reality that which baptism [only symbolically] indicates. For faith is a submersion of the old man and a rise of the new man."[16] To be sure, there is also behind this statement inherently a concept of baptism which is not in agreement with that of the Anabaptists.[17] But in the exposition of the relationship between faith and sacrament some primary impulses are given upon which the Anabaptists were then able to base their view of baptism and their concept of communion.

Sixth, from the above the Anabaptists were able to deduce also their new concept of the church. If living faith is in this manner constitutive for all Christian life, it was only necessary to include the idea that children could not actually believe in order to see the necessity for a voluntary church limited to adults. Luther, of course, did not go this far. In his mind it was possible for the faith of anoth-

dran, wie er glewbt, und muss fur sich selb sehen, das er recht glewbe. Denn so wenig als eyn ander fur mich ynn die helle odder hymel faren kan, so wenig kan er auch fur mich glewben, und so wenig er myr kan hymel oder hell auff odder zu schliessen, so wenig kan er mich zum zum glawben oder unglawben treyben. Wyl es denn eym iglichen auff seym gewissen ligt, wie er glewbt odder nicht glewbt, und damit der welltlichen gewallt keyn abbruch geschicht, sol wie auch zu friden syn und yhrs dings wartten und lassen glewben sonst oder so, wie man kan unnd will, und niemant mit gewallt dringen, Dann es ist eyn frey werck umb den glawben, datzu man niemandt kan zwingen. Ya es ist eyn gottlich werck ym geyst, schweyg denn das es eusserliche gewallt sollt erzwingen und schaffen. Da her ist der gemeyne spruch genomen, den Augustinus auch hatt: Zum glawben kan unnd soll man niemants zwingen."

13 *Ibid.*, 268: "Ketzerey ist eyn geystlich ding, das kan man mitt keynem eyssen hawen, mit keynem fewr verbrennen, mitt keynem wasser ertrencken. Es ist aber alleyn das Gottis wortt da, das thutts. . . ." Cf. *WA*, 15:218 f. (*Brief an die Fürsten zu Sachsen*, 1524.) This is also the basis of the concept held by both Luther and the Anabaptists, that the two powers should be separate.

14 Cf. W. Köhler, Art. "Luther" in *Mennonitisches Lexikon* II, esp. 706 f.

15 E.g., von Muralt and Schmid, *op cit.*, 103, 19: "dan dheiner (keiner) oberkeit zustannde, das gots wort mit irem gwalt zu handhaben, diweil doch dasselbig fryg sye." See also H. S. Bender, "The Anabaptists and Religious Liberty in the 16th Century," *Arch f. Ref. Gesch.*, Vol. 44 (1953), 32-51.

16 *WA*, 6:532 f. (*De captivitate Babylonica*, 1520): "Ita baptismus neminem iustificat, nec nulli prodest, sed fides in verbum promissionis, cui additur baptismus, haec enim iustificat, et implet id, quod baptismus significat. Fides enim est submersio veteris hominis et emersio novi hominis."

17 For Luther's conception of baptism in this connection see W. Köhler, *op. cit.*

er to substitute for the faith of a child, and then by intercession to achieve for the child a faith of his own.[18] In Luther, however, we do find at least the idea of such a church limited to a small circle which would be composed of such as earnestly desired to be Christian.[19] An argumentation of this kind within Luther's own mind surely ought to indicate that so-called sectarian strivings could well start with Luther's ideas.[20]

Seventh, many things could still be said about Luther's *Formalprinzip*, i.e., that the Scriptures are the only norm in all these questions as opposed to all tradition. Luther for example at one time established this thesis: It is better to believe a simple layman who cites Scripture than a pope or council which cites no Scripture.[21] But this position of Luther is so well known as to need no further proof.[22]

Thus there is no question that certain ideas and slogans were thrown into the theological discussion by Luther which are found again among the Anabaptists, so that we are now in a position to say: At least in this general manner the Anabaptists were the children of the Reformation movement initiated by Luther. But are there also more specific connections between the Anabaptists and Luther? Is there a dependence of a more direct nature? I shall briefly mention the possibilities. Karlstadt and Thomas Müntzer, of course, were largely pupils of Luther; Karlstadt in his position against the papacy and its institutions; Müntzer in his theology of the cross.[23] But we do not reckon either of these actually among the Anabaptists. Their relationship to the Anabaptists is to be discussed later[24] and will therefore not be considered here. Of the Swiss Anabaptists Hubmaier is probably the one who is most likely to have been influenced by Luther. He received his first impulse to join the Reformation by

18 *WA*, 6:538 (*De captivitate . . .*): "Opponetur forsitan iis, quae dicta sunt, baptismus parvulorum, qui promissionem dei non capiant, nec fidem baptismi habere possunt, ideque aut non requiri fidem, aut parvulos frustra baptisari. Hic dico, quod omnes dicunt, fide aliena parvulis succrui, illorum, qui offerunt eos "(1520!). On the faith of infants as produced thereby, see *WA*, 17:2:79 ff.

19 *WA*, 19:75 ("Vorrede" of the *Deutsche Messe*, 1526).

20 On the side of the Anabaptists already in Sept., 1524 (Grebel to Müntzer): "Es ist weger (besser), dass wenig recht bericht werdind durch dass wort Gottes, recht gloubind und wandlind in tugenden und brücken, denn dass fil uss vermischter ler falsch hinderlistig gloubind" (Von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.*, 16, 15). On this point and the point of freedom of conscience L. Scharnschlager expressly bases his position on Luther in a deposition before the Strasbourg Council on June 16, 1534, to be published in the edition of the Strasbourg *Taüferakten* now being prepared by Dr. J. Rott.

21 *WA*, 2:649.

22 It should not be necessary to argue about the Biblicism of the Anabaptists.

23 Very good comments on it, which in part also apply to the Anabaptists and have to this extent been used in the preceding, are found in Holl's work, *Luther und die Schwärmer, Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 1:420 ff., and in H. Bornkamm's *Mystik, Spiritualismus und die Anfänge des Pietismus* (Giessen, 1926), 5.

24 This paper was followed at Göttingen by a paper by Alexander Rempel on the dependence of the Anabaptists upon Storch, Karlstadt, Müntzer, and the Bohemian Brethren. The best work to date on this subject is H. S. Bender's "Die Zwickauer Propheten, Thomas Müntzer und die Täufer," in *Theologische Zeitschrift* (1952), 8:262 ff.

reading Luther's works. But very soon he came under the influence of Zwingli's thought, so that Luther's influence took second place for him.[25]

Conrad Grebel also probably read Luther's works. Precisely in his decisive years a long series of important writings by the German Reformer had been reprinted in Basel and Zürich. But the Luther writings mentioned by Grebel[26] are unimportant, and in view of other factors any possible dependence becomes unlikely. We also know of a letter written by Grebel to Luther,[27] which shows us that the course of the Reformation in Wittenberg was certainly also being followed in the circles that later founded Anabaptism in Switzerland, but their knowledge was not very extensive. It was probably derived by reading Karlstadt's booklet against the "sparing (*Schonen*) of the weak,"[28] but also from hearsay. The bearers of this hearsay may have been simple men like the goldsmith Hans Huiuff, but certainly very little substantial theological thought was transmitted in this way. The reaction of the Anabaptist circles was almost entirely criticism of Luther and not a positive adoption of the Wittenberg Reformation. In respect to such influence Switzerland had a much more important man, namely, Zwingli himself. When we find among the Anabaptists in Switzerland ideas with which Luther inaugurated the Reformation but do not quite know in what way these ideas may have reached them, the safest guess is always Zwingli. He reworked in a very independent manner the content of the new ideas being developed in Lutheran Germany, and relayed it with Zwinglian coloration to Switzerland.[29] We must therefore take a closer look at the dependence of the Anabaptists on Zwingli. Before we do this, however, we must take a brief look at the relations of the Anabaptists to Erasmus.

First of all it is clear that for Erasmus as for Luther, there are points in common with the Anabaptists, which, of course, are accompanied by differences in many other points as could also have been fully stated in the case of Luther. The common points could lead to a conclusion of direct dependence, but such a dependence can scarcely be proved for Erasmus either. To illustrate the common points I cite several sentences from Erasmus' *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*

25 Cf. Karl Sachsse, *D. Baltasar Hubmaier als Theologe* (Berlin, 1914), 130 ff.
26 H. S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel* (Goshen, 1950), 194 and 259, footnote 79.
27 *Ibid.*, 119 f.
28 "Ob man gmach faren und es ergernüssen der schwachen verschonen soll" (Basel, 1524). Cf. von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.*, 22, 26-28.
29 This is a crude version of the very complex problem of the dependence of Zwingli upon Luther. For particulars see the recent works: L. von Muralt, "Probleme der Zwingliforschung," *Schweizerische Zeitscht. f. Allgemeine Gesch.* (1946), 4:247-67; O. Farner, *Holdrych Zwingli* (Zürich, 1946), 2:310 ff.; A. Rich, *Die Anfänge der Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis* (Zürich, 1949), 73-95.

both from the introduction and from the body of the booklet, written in 1518.

It is necessary that we swear only by the head if we want to be real, true Christians (D IV).

Everyone must set up a standard to which he is to fight through, but the only standard is Christ Jesus and His unique evangelical teaching (C a).

Christ's teaching shall, however, not be mingled with human teaching. The learned give uncertain counsel, for light of faith does not shine in them (B II a).

No one is excepted from the duty of striving after such an example, . . . as if being God-fearing and Christian pertain only to some and not to all men (C a).

Believe me, my most precious brother, there is no attack of the enemies so violent nor temptation so powerful that it cannot be easily repelled by a devotional practice of the Holy Scripture and by an industrious reading (VII b).

Therefore if you submit entirely to the Holy Scripture and consider and reflect on the law of God by day and night, you will not fear the might of fear (IX b).

The Holy Scripture is the bread of heaven (XI).

These statements, which especially stress three things, namely, "Christ only," discipleship in life, and the importance of the Holy Scripture, could easily be multiplied. They can also be supplemented by other citations on other themes which were not foreign to the Anabaptists, such as the lay priesthood,[31] the question of warfare (really of nonresistance),[32] and the idea of the church as a brotherhood united by love.[33] The scholar will, to be sure, notice at once that Anabaptist piety is by no means circumscribed by these statements. Nevertheless these are motives that we know. Did the Anabaptists receive them directly from Erasmus? This question is particularly pertinent since there were among the first Anabaptists two humanists of no slight education, Grebel and Manz.

I shall answer the question briefly according to H. S. Bender's investigation of the case of Grebel who can probably be considered as an example for Manz.[34] During most of the period of his univer-

30 According to the translation by Leo Jud (Basel, 1621), possibly the German translation best known to the Anabaptists.

31 Cf. his positive answer on this point to the Bohemian Brethren: Joh. Th. Müller, *Gesch. d. Böhm. Brüder* (1922), 1:393 f.

32 Also the two best-known pamphlets by Erasmus against war were published in German in Switzerland: *Dulce bellum inexpertis* in 1519 in Cratander's shop in Basel (in the fall of 1521 Grebel was a proofreader in this shop), and *Querela pacis* in 1521 by Froschauer in Zürich. On this point there is greater agreement between the Anabaptists and Erasmus than on any other. For here Erasmus' thought is derived from the Bible and is Christo-centric (cf. A. Rich, *op. cit.*, 21-23), and at times even defends absolute nonresistance: Christ commanded His followers "gantz und gar, das sy nit widerstanden dem bösen, das ist dem schaden und unbil, so inen gschicht. Gebüttet jnen, das sy guts thun sollen denen, so inen böss thund, guts wünschen denen, so inen böss wünschen" (*Ein klag des Frydens*, 1521, fol. 11a).

33 *Querela pacis, passim.*

34 H. S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel* (Goshen, 1950), 65 ff., 192, 200 ff. Concerning the humanistic education of Manz nothing certain is known.

sity study Grebel was the pupil of humanists who had little to do with Erasmian ideas of reform.[35] In the years, however, in which he might have been open to Erasmian ideas, he was so deeply a pupil of Zwingli that Zwingli's influence and mediation give the explanation for all discoverable Erasmian ideas. This is also substantiated by the fact that Grebel like Zwingli goes far beyond Erasmus in content. Another example of this is the Bible circle which Castelberger conducted[36] in Zürich in 1522. The ideas expressed here have a certain similarity with those presented by Erasmus in his *Enchiridion*.[37] Nevertheless it is quite clear in this case that Castelberger got his ideas from Zwingli, as he himself expressly said.[38]

In conclusion, Ludwig Keller's theory should be mentioned, viz., that Erasmus with other humanists in Basel formed a kind of Waldensian brotherhood from which the Zürich Anabaptist leaders issued. To be sure, there are some very friendly expressions of Erasmus toward the Bohemian Brethren (who were in many respects not unlike the Anabaptists) and these in turn tried to win Erasmus for their ideas.[39] Nevertheless in decisive points Erasmus' thinking is completely different; later he was able to make very derogatory judgments about the Anabaptists.[40] The question marks which Paul Burkhardt put after Keller's theory[41] must therefore remain.

But now to Zwingli! Here it is not necessary to begin with the presentation of general points held in common, but it is possible to trace the most direct dependence of the Anabaptists on him through a period of years. Research has already pictured this circumstantially: The Anabaptists in Zürich proceeded from a circle of close friends of Zwingli, who at the beginning of the 1520's supported Zwingli most powerfully in his reform efforts, and were theologically completely dependent upon him.[42] This dependence extends so far that even after the final separation from Zwingli his theology remained so

35 It is not clear whether or not Erasmus' pacifism makes an exception here. It is worth noting that in 1520 Grebel's friend Mycomius, under the influence of Erasmus, wrote a pamphlet against war, for which Grebel was very enthusiastic (Bender, 200 f.). Later, when he became Zwingli's opponent in this question, he must have recalled Erasmus' position. Nevertheless it is noteworthy that in the decisive statement his terminology is drawn from Müntzer's theory of the cross (von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.*, 17, 18).

36 Von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.*, 397. The dating of the item (note 1) is incorrect. The hearing probably took place no later than 1523. Cf. the testimonial for Castelberger's school and reading in May, 1522, in E. Egli, *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation 1519-1533* (Zürich, 1879), No. 252.

37 Compare the common-sense piety ("What is better and more just . . .") of pp. 386, 22 ff. with Erasmus' style of argument, *op. cit.*, fol. 11a ff.; especially the statements against war on p. 387 with the corresponding statements of Erasmus (cf. footnote 32).

38 *Ibid.*, 386, 23: "der . . . Andres hab inen geseit, wie M. Uolrich (Zwingli) vormals ouch habe gepredigt. . . ."

39 Cf. footnote 31.

40 *Menn. Lex.* I, Art. "Erasmus."

41 Paul Burckhardt, *Die Basler Taufer* (Basel, 1898), 6 f.

42 The most decided proponent of this thesis was probably August Bauer in *Zwingli's Theologie* (1889), especially 2:47 ff. ("Anabaptism was an indigenous growth in Zürich," p. 56.) His idea was followed by W. Köhler, F. Blanke, and H. S. Bender.

determinative for Anabaptist concepts that these concepts in their principal elements can be largely explained on the basis of this dependence. In the following I shall point out the three most important characteristics.

Blanke, in the essay already mentioned, has clearly worked out the center of Anabaptist piety, which is the preaching of repentance and conversion. Blanke presents the course of penitence among the Anabaptists according to the records thus:[43] "It begins by striking the conscience of the individual person and making him restless on account of his sinfulness. The next step is beseeching God for the ability to fully recognize one's sin; then follows the breaking through of this recognition when one's guilt and sin are revealed to the penitent person." Out of the depths of the distress of sin rises the cry for salvation, for "a washing away and forgiveness of sins," for the "grace of God." But this salvation can only be expected if one is willing henceforth to renounce and forsake all that is sinful. "Forgiveness is experienced in baptism," which is a visible sign that God has pardoned the sinner.

Laying aside for the moment the question of baptism, these conceptions are from first to last typically Zwinglian. This could be demonstrated by many quotations. A very clear example is the first part of the *Christliche Einleitung* of 1523.[44] In it Zwingli presents the basic content of Christianity, and indeed one is tempted to say that he does so in amazingly Anabaptist tones. The Anabaptists did, in fact, have their theology from Zwingli. Zwingli begins with a call to repentance and reform, therein following John the Baptist and Christ who introduced their proclamation of the kingdom of God in this way. Zwingli then develops the stages of this repentance in the same form as the Anabaptists in Zollikon actually experienced them in 1525: recognition of sin, longing for salvation, forgiveness of sin through faith in Christ, and finally reform of life. In his Zwingli biography Oskar Farner has dedicated an important chapter to Zwingli's preaching, and has proved that the substance of his proclamation was precisely this kind of preaching of penitence and salvation.[45] He who knows this Zwingli and then reads the writings of the Anabaptists can have no further doubt that the Anabaptists are here completely dependent on Zwingli, even to the very point of formulation.[46]

This is also the case, with slight degrees of difference, for the

43 Blanke, *Theol. Zeitschrift* (1952), 8:252 ff. Also Blanke, *Brüder in Christo*, 36 ff.
44 *Huldreich Zwingli's Sämtliche Werke* (1905 ff. hereafter cited as *ZW*), 2:626 ff.
45 Oskar Farner, *Huldrych Zwingli* (Zürich, 1954), 3:142 ff.
46 Blanke, *loc. cit.*, 252. Here Blanke points out details.

other two points to be considered, viz., the Anabaptist concepts of baptism and communion. The first comprehensive formulation that we have on the Anabaptist side is found in Grebel's letter to Thomas Müntzer of September 5, 1524.[47] Point by point Grebel deals with the nature of these two sacraments and how they are used; seventeen theses on communion[48] and about half that number (not numbered) on baptism.[49] A comparison with Zwingli's corresponding views shows (and this has frequently been ascertained in summarized form) that in Grebel's exposition on communion every point has been taken over from Zwingli.[51] Indeed, the formulations agree so minutely that the first glance shows that it is not a question of a *possibility* of Zwingli's being the source of Grebel's ideas, but of the *certainty* that he was that source. In particular it is Zwingli's concept of communion as creating fellowship and obligating to fellowship[52] (which was made known in May, 1524) that constitutes the chief theme also for Grebel. Even if some specific formulations cannot be found word for word in Zwingli,[53] or did not find fixed written expression,[54] nevertheless the rooting in Zwingli's basic conceptions is so obvious that it is pure chance that we have no written expression of Zwingli's. He must certainly have preached it.

Not quite so clear, but still unmistakable, is Grebel's dependence on Zwingli in the matter of baptism. It is well known that in his letter to Müntzer, Grebel was strongly under the influence of Müntzer's concept of baptism, as expressed in the latter's *Protestation,* which Grebel acknowledges as being "ten times better" than his own.[55] But from the corresponding statements of Müntzer[56] only two theses can be extracted that recur in Grebel, of which Grebel himself confesses that he had not quite understood or examined the second:[57] (1) that Christ and the apostles did not baptize a single infant, and that the ancient institution of catechetical instruction is evidence of the practice of adult baptism; (2) that salvation does not depend on water but on faith and on the waters of tribulation experienced be-

47 Von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.,* No. 14, pp. 13-21.
48 *Ibid.,* 14:30-16:4. Nos. 1-9 count as one thesis in my numeration.
49 *Ibid.,* 17:36 ff.
50 Most recently Bender, *Grebel,* 198.
51 See the parallel placing at the end of this article.
52 First in *Vorschlag wegen der Bilder und der Messe,* end of May, 1524 (*ZW,* 2:114-21, esp. 123-29). Then in *Christliche Antwort Burgermeisters und Rats zu Zürich an Bischof Hugo* (Aug. 18, 1524), *ZW,* 3:146-229, esp. 226-28, and also *Adversus Hieronymum Emserum antibolon* (Aug. 20, 1524), *ZW,* 3:230-87, esp. 282. As yet no research has been published about possible foreign source for this view by Zwingli.
53 E.g., Nos. 14 and 15 according to my numeration. Cf. *infra.*
54 Nos. 12 and 20b.
55 Von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.,* 18, 26 and 20, 31.
56 Otto H. Brandt, *Thomas Müntzer, Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Jena, 1933), 134-36 (Art. 5-7).
57 Namely, the strange interpretation of John 3 and the allegorical interpretation of the water in Müntzer's Art. 6. Von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.,* 20, 4 f.

cause of that faith. In fact Grebel's doctrine of baptism is already more detailed than Müntzer's and to this extent surpasses it. It is even critical of Müntzer and rejects in advance, from an entirely independent point of view, any possible ultimate complete repudiation of baptism by Müntzer.[58] Grebel's independence is partly explained by his occupation with the Bible.[59] Nevertheless it must have followed upon a given basic position and here August Baur has proved that it was Zwingli who had furnished all the preconditions.[60]

I shall therefore only need to summarize briefly: (1) for Zwingli it was not the water but faith (i.e., the thing believed: Christ's death for us) that cleanses from sin; (2) faith is a product of instruction; hence in the old church a product of the catechetical system; (3) therefore in the early church adult baptism, not infant baptism, was customary; (4) the children (who die) of God-fearing parents are more probably not damned than damned. Grebel, of course, goes beyond these views, presented by Zwingli in 1523, by demanding the abolition of infant baptism, whereas Zwingli sponsored a more intensive system of instruction and accepted confirmation in place of the baptismal confession.[61] But the Anabaptists themselves testify that, as Grebel said, "Zwingli had led them into this thing."[62] And the Reformer confesses that he once shared their views.[63] This can scarcely be doubted. Grebel himself excludes the influence of a third party (besides Zwingli and Müntzer), by designating Müntzer specifically as the only one of whom he knows in September, 1524, that has publicly repudiated infant baptism.[64] These four points which I have pointed out, and in which Grebel reveals himself as a pupil of Zwingli, could be supplemented by a comparison in other topics.[65] But the question of baptism and communion and the dogmatics of repentance occupied the center of interest at that time.[66]

58 *Ibid.*, 20, 2 ff.: "Diner buchlin und protestationen halb, so find ich dich on schuld, du verwerfist dann den touff gar, dan ich nit daruss verstan." Grebel's suspicion is justified to this extent that for Müntzer the form of baptism was in the final analysis unimportant. Adult baptism was to Müntzer unnecessary. Adult baptism is, however, not contrary to his basic position, and he therefore certainly does not completely reject it. Here, H. S. Bender has misunderstood Annemarie Lohmann (*Die Zwickauer Propheten . . . , loc. cit.*, 265).

59 E.g., von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.*, 18, 9 ff.

60 *Zwinglis Theologie* (1889), 2:51-56. Cf. also for the following M. Usteri, *Darstellung der Tauflehre Zwinglis, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der wiedertäuferischen Streitigkeiten* (*Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1882), 205 ff.

61 The chief evidence in the 18th article of Zwingli's *Auslegung der Schlussreden*, under the title, "Von der firmung": *ZW*, 2:122 ff.

62 Von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.*, 90, 8; cf. also Felix Manz in his *Protestation* (*Ibid.*, 27, 19 ff.), and the apparently early more independent Hubmaier (*Ibid.*, 194). Cf. the explanation of this point by Carl Sachsse, *op. cit.*, 136 ff. and 157 ff.

63 *ZW*, 2:228 ff.

64 Von Muralt and Schmid, *op. cit.*, 18, 32 ff. He wanted to begin to write to all who "so biss har (*on dich*) von dem touff verfürlich und wüssenlich schribend und die unsinnig gotzlesterig form des kindertouffs tutscht hand, alss Luter, Löw, Osiander und die Strassburger, und ouch etliche noch schantlicher gehandlet hand." Thus Grebel knows of a large number of writings on baptism, especially liturgies on baptism (cf. Bender, *Grebel*, 271, note 12), and he was planning to oppose all of them by letter (thus he was planning to write also to Osiander and the Reformers of Strasbourg!). All except Müntzer advocated infant baptism.

65 All these themes have been treated above in connection with Luther and Erasmus.

66 In a letter Grebel wrote to Vadian on Sept. 3, 1524, he mentioned "two common sub-

And now comes the question that must assert itself under such conditions, which is one of the most significant problems in the origins of the Anabaptist movement. If the Anabaptists in decisive matters were pupils of the Reformers, especially Zwingli, wherein and on what grounds did they break with the Reformers? And indeed this is the real question: Did the Anabaptists merely radicalize Zwingli's theses, either because Zwingli had not remained true to his original views[67] or because he did not proceed rapidly or logically enough, so that we must attribute the break between them to differences in character and temperament or perhaps to differences in education? (In this case the cause of the separation would have to be sought in the inadequacies of the persons concerned,[68] and the points of opposition would not have developed until later.[69]) Or is there an essentially different conception of the Christian message at the heart of the break? Wherein would the peculiar character of such a conception lie?

The idea of the voluntary church has been suggested as the essence of the difference. Surely in this point Anabaptism is an important historical phenomenon. But the very concept of an Anabaptist "people" (*Volk*) or a Menno "people," which later developed within the group, shows that already in the early generations the movement has taken on a character that one might almost call *volkskirchlich,* whereas on the other hand the state churches, in those places where they lost the favor of the government, showed that their essential nature was not absolutely determined by their union with the state. What then is the essential Anabaptist character as opposed to the Reformers? Another problem: granted that there is such an essential Anabaptist character, how did it succeed in establishing itself in view of the Anabaptist dependence on the Reformers which was so striking, especially in Zürich? Did the Anabaptists arrive at the new ideas themselves, or did they get them from others? Did the ideas grow upon them out of their own study of the Bible, or were they transmitted from some older ecclesiastical tradition, perhaps, as has sometimes been assumed, by way of the Waldenses or Bohemian Brethren?[70]

jects" that he wanted to treat (v. Muralt-Schmid, *loc. cit.*, 12, 7 ff.), probably referring to communion and baptism. The first result of his study respecting the two themes is preserved in the letter to Müntzer (cf. *loc. cit.*, 18, 31 f.).

67 But compare the significant statements by L. von Muralt in his article, "Zum Problem Reformation and Täufertum," *Zwingliana* (1934), Vol. 6, No. 2, esp. 75 ff.

68 In this sphere also theologically relevant (though historically hard to grasp) decisions are made.

69 Thus the Reformers Zwingli and Bullinger conceived it, and therefore accused the Anabaptists of separatism.

70 These questions were intended as a transition to the discussion which was to follow (see footnote 24).

The Sources of Grebel's Doctrine of the Communion Illustrated by Direct Quotations from Zwingli's Writings[71]

GREBEL	ZWINGLI
1–9. Das Abendmahl soll ohne Gesange gefeiert werden.	II 788: ". . . so ist es ein närrisch, unnütz, ja ein hinderzügigs ding von dem waren gots dienst, das nüt sölland gsang (das Singen ohne allen Wert), so man allethalben in den templen rüchlet, das nit allein der gmein man nit verstat, sunder ouch vil der pfaffen."
10. Dass nachtmal der vereimbarung hat Christus uffgesetzt und pfantzet.	For the concept of "Vereimbarung" see No. 13.—III 123: ". . . und hat . . . Christus, unser heiland, diss sacrament ufgesetzt . . . ."
11. Die wort, so Mathei 26. Marci 14. Lucae 22. und 1. Cor. 11, sollend allein gebrucht werden, weder minder noch me.	III 123: "Und finden by Mattheo 26, Mrco 14, Luca 22, und Paulo 1. Cor. 11 miteinandren, das Christus dis sacrament sölcher gstalt hatt yngesetzt. . . . ." And: III 143: "Wir wellend . . . dis helig sacrament allein bruchen nach dem ynsatz Christi."
12. Der diener uss der gmain solte sy vorsprechen uss einem der evangelisten oder uss Paulo.	(See above note 54.)
13. Sind wort dess uffgesetten malss der vereimbarung, nit der consecrierung.	III 124: "Dis sacrament ist ein innerliche und usserliche vereimbarung der Christenmenschen." III 228: "Darumb es Paulus koenoniam nennet, das ist ein gemeine vereimbarung." Rejection of the sacramental concept already in 18. *Schlussrede* (Jan., 1523).
14. Es soll ein gmein brot sin, on götzen und zusatz.	VIII 85: "Ego haud aliter panem et vinum esse puto, quam aqua est in baptismo. . . ."
15. Wann ess bringt ein glichsenden andacht und anbettung dess brotes und ein abzug von dem innerlichen. Es soll ouch ein gmein trinkgschirr sin.	III 127: "Es ist ouch ze besorgen, das dero vil signind, die sich des ufhebens (=Elevation) dis sacraments—das ouch von Christo nit gebrucht ist—schwarl ich geruchen werdind (=zufrieden geben). dan sy sich ruemend, so sy hinder der mess gestanden, sy habind unseren herrgott gesehen. Die söllend sölch meinung us krafft des worts Christi vallen lassen Jo. 1: Got hat nie nieman gsehen. Man sicht (=sieht) inn hie mit lyblichen ougen nit. Es sol ouch der einig got angebettet werden." III 126: ". . . heisst er üns us dem kelch alle trinken."

71 Quotations from Grebel in left column taken from von Muralt and Schmid (see footnote 48). Citations from Zwingli in right column, taken from *Zwingli's Werke* (see footnote 52); volume and page reference are given in each case.

16. Diesses wurd die anbettung abtun und recht erkanntnuss und verstand dess nachtmalss bringen, die wil dass brott nüt anderss ist dann brot, im glouben der lib (=Leib) Christi und ein inlibung mit Christo und den bruederen; wann im geist und liebe muss man essen und trinken, wie Jo. im 6. ca. und in den andren antzeigt, Paulus im 10. u. 11. zum Corinthieren, actum 2. clar erlernet wirdt.

(See the quotations in numbers 14 and 15.) III 226: ". . . dass alle die gloubtind . . . sich under einander für bruder hieltind und für ein lychnam (=Leib) Christi, des houpt er selbst ist." III 227: ". . . dass sy nun einen geist, liebe und gmuet zesamen hettind." (For John 6, "Ex eo capite nos orsi sumus," see III 336, II 142 f. and VIII 86 f. For I Cor. 10 and 11 see III 124 f., 126, 228.)

17. Ob ess wol nun brott ist, so gloub und bruderliche liebe vorgat, sol ess unss antzeigen, dab wir warlich win brott und lib und ware brüder mitteinander werind und sin weltind etc.

III 125: "Dann wir, die menge, sind ein brot und ein lychaam (=Leib), denn wir mitteilend alle von einem brot." III 228: "Und so er das mit seinem bruder ibt, und der bruder mit imm, verzügend sy bed, dass sy erlösste kinder gottes sind und desshalb kintlich und bruderlich mit einander söllland läben."
Ibid.: "Wo nun diss sacrament by allen Christen zuo solchem bruoder ein grüwen xin, sinen bruoder ze überniessen, sen, sinen gemahel ze eebrechen, inn ze tod schlahen oder verraten, so er in dem pflicht, das Christus yngesetzt hat, sich offenlich mit imm verbunden hette. Und wo er sölchs übertretten, hette er das sacrament, das ein stät verjehen (=Bekennen) ist, das Christus für uns gesterben ist, zu einer verdamnus geesen und truncken."

18. So einer aber sich funde nit bruoderlichen mögen läben, isst er zuo der verdamnuss, wann er isst on underscheid wie ein ander mal, und schendt die liebe, dass inner band, und das brott, dass usser.

(Cf. III 124 f. for the sacrament as "innerliche und usserliche vereinbarung der Christenmenschen.")

19. Wann ess ermant in ouch nit an den lib und blut Christi, dess testaments an dem crütz, dass er umb Christi und

III 126: "Denn das ist die widergedechtnus, das wir uns erinnerind des lydens Christi, das er das um unsertwillen erlidten hab. . . . Und wie er sich für uns ggeben hat, also sind ouch wir schuldig, einer sich für den

der brüdern, dess houptes und glidern willen läben und liden well.

andern ze geben als für sinen bruder, ja, als für sin eigen glid."

20. Ess solt ouch nit von dir ministriert werden. Darmit gieng die mess ab, dass einig essen; wann dass nachtmal ist ein antzeigung der vereimbarung, nit ein mess und sacrament; darumb sol ess nienan allein bruchen, weder im todbett nach sunst; dass brott soll ouch ni verschlossen werden etc., uff ein einige person, wann niemantz soll im selbe dass brott der vereinbarten nemmen allein, er syge dann mit sim selb uneiss, dass ist keiner etc.

(See the quotations for No. 13.)

(See above note 54.)

(See the quotations for No. 21.)

(See above note 54.)

21. Ess sol ouch nit gebrucht werden in templen nach aller gschrift und gschicht, wann ess bringt ein falschen andacht.

VIII 87: "Atqui ut baptismus tantum est, dum lavatur credens, non, dum aqua in templo servatur, . . . (Comparison with the communion:) Metuo nobis omnibus vehementer ab idololatria, quam nimirum isti cum sua transsubstantiatione pepererunt; panis enim si illic tantum est, ubi nos corpus et sanguinem Christi esse docemus, in conservaculis dico, in quibus panem consecratum, tenemus, panem igitur adorant necesse est, qui adorent, quod illic est" (VIII 88).

22. Ess solt offt und fil gebrucht werden.

III 228: "Wo nun diss sacrament by allen Christen zuo sölchem fürnemen *für und für gebrucht*. . . ."

23. Solt nit on die regel Christi Mathei im XVIII (18, 15-18) gebruncht werden, wol aber ess ist je nit dess Herren nachtmal, wann on die selb so loufft jederman nach dem usseren, dess inner, die liebe, lasst man faren, gand brueder und falschbrueder hinzuo oder essends.

(Only evidence from the time after September 5, 1524:) III 349: "et rursuste adstringit (Christ in the communion) ad christianam vitam, ut si forte impudenter vivere non poenitat, a reliquis membris excludaris. Hinc veteribus excommunicatio et absentio." Cf. III 807 and IV 25-34. (See the quotation for No. 18b.)

24. So du ess je zuodienen (ministrieren) wilt, woltend wir, ess geschech on pfäffische kleidung und messgewand, on gsang, on zuosatz.

ZW II 789: "Die wyl dann weder das gsang weder die kleider nienar zuo guotist anderst dann zu eim abzug des rechten, waren gebettes, das ist: der uffhebung des gmuets zuo got, so muoss dasselbig hyn und abweg gleyt werden . . . ." (For the change in his demands in this point, however, see 620 f. and Egli's guess, *ibid.* 618: influence from Grebel's radicalism?)

25. Der zitt halb wüssend wir, dass Christus den apostlen im nachtmal geben und die Corinthier ouch also gebrucht hand. Bestimmend by unss kein gewüsse tzit etc.

II 788: "Der zyt halben: Das testament sol an keyn zyt gebunden sin, sunder, zuo welicher stund einer des begert, so mag er dasselbig empfahen."

THE OFFICE OF ELDER IN ANABAPTIST-MENNONITE HISTORY

CORNELIUS KRAHN*

"Elder" is the name for the highest and most responsible office of the ministry in a large number of Mennonite congregations and conferences. The origin of the word goes back to Biblical times and is mentioned in Acts 14:23; I Tim. 5:17, etc. The New Testament equivalent is presbyter or bishop. In early Anabaptist usage both terms, elder and bishop, were employed. Gradually, however, the term elder (German, *Aeltester;* Dutch, *oudste)* became predominant until the usage of bishop disappeared in Europe with the possible exception of the Hutterites. At present, wherever this office is referred to in Europe, it is either *Aeltester* or *Pastor* or *Dominee.* In America, however, large groups, particularly those of Pennsylvania-German background, use the term bishop only.

About the calling of the elders and ministers the Wismar Agreements state "that no one is permitted to travel from church to church to teach and preach unless he has been sent or ordained for this purpose by the church or the elder."[1] Kühler says the minister-elder had to have a double calling, one by God and the other by the congregation.[2] Vos, on the other hand, emphasized that the calling and the authority of the early Anabaptist leaders had been arbitrary and dictatorial, stating: "The elders had the say-so in everything and the members in nothing."[3] Kühler insisted that the earliest practices were democratic and that through men like Menno, Dirk Philips, and Leenaert Bouwens dictatorial methods were introduced.[4]

On this question it is clear that it was a principle of the Anabaptists to have their congregations function in a democratic way in contrast to the large state churches, which had a somewhat episcopal form of church government, operating usually from the top down. It would, however, be misleading to assume that the early Anabaptists were able to develop and maintain a thoroughly congregational type of church government. This was impossible because of the severe persecution, under which the congregations could survive only through strong leadership, which was either delegated or assumed. In principle and also in practice, when compared with the state

*Cornelius Krahn is professor of church history and director of the Mennonite historical library of Bethel College, and the editor of *Mennonite Life.*

1 *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* (The Hague, 1910), 7:53.

2 W. J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de Zestiende Eeuw* (Haarlem, 1932), 297.

3 Vos, "De keuze tot Doopsgezind Bisschop," in *Nederl. Archief voor Kerkgesch.* (1921), 16:195, 202.

4 Kühler, *op. cit.,* 301 ff.

churches, the Anabaptist congregations were democratic. However, these emergency conditions necessitated and were conducive to the development of strong leadership. Menno relates in great detail how he received his calling as elder after his conversion. When he was studying the Word of God in quietness he was approached by representatives of the peaceful Anabaptists who urged him to become the leader of the sheep without a shepherd. A period of prayer on the part of the congregation as well as on his own part preceded the acceptance of the call.[5]

The early Anabaptist ministers often had to defend their calling in their disputes with Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed ministers, who more or less claimed that their call was based on the apostolic succession, and denied that the Anabaptist elders and ministers had a proper calling. This concerned the Anabaptist leaders very little. Since they did not find a "true apostolic church" anywhere, and since the Bible demanded it, they felt not only authorized but compelled to establish congregations. Elders and preachers were not working in their own authority, but had received their calling from a congregation or directly from God. Menno Simons says: "Ministers of the Sacred Word are to be called in an orderly manner, either by the Lord Himself or through the God-fearing."[6]

The Emden *Protocol* (1579) treats in detail the call and function of elders and ministers of the sixteenth-century Anabaptists of Northwest Europe. Pieter van Ceulen states: "Bishops and preachers (*dienaren*) are chosen by the congregations under God's guidance by majority vote with fasting and prayer unto the Lord. Such ministers are ordained by the laying on of hands of the elders."[7] And again this is emphasized when Brixius Gerrits says: "The entire congregation must meet to elect elders or preachers (*leeraers ofte dienaren*)."[8]

The office of a minister was twofold. Some ministers were ordained to preach only and were known as *Diener am Wort* (servant of the Word), *dienaar, Vermaner,* or *Prediger.* The elders or bishops were authorized to perform all functions, the *voller Dienst* (full service) of the church. In addition to this, of course, there were also deacons, the *Armendiener* (servants of the poor). The *Protocol* and *Het beginsel en voortganck der geschillen . . .* refer to the elders as *leeraar, oudste,* and *biscop.* The Protocol uses all of these terms, while *Het beginsel* consistently uses *leeraar* only.[9] The latter uses

5 Menno Simons, *Complete Works* (Elkhart, 1871), 3 ff.
6 Cornelius Krahn, *Menno Simons (1496-1561): Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Theologie der Taufgesinnten* (Karlsruhe, 1936), 144.
7 *Protocol, Dat is, Alle handelinge des gesprecks tot Emden . . .* (Emden, 1579), 229b.
8 *Ibid.,* 239a.
9 *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* 7:511 ff.

dienaer and *vermaender* (*Vermaner*) for preacher. These usages are also described by de Hoop Scheffer in "Oude Gemeente verordeningen."[10]

Thus in the early days the Anabaptists of Northwest Europe spoke of their elders interchangeably as *oudste, leeraar,* and *bisschop.* Such functions as the administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper and the ordination of church officers could be performed only by holders of this office. They are also referred to as *leeraar in den vollen dienst.* The *dienaar* (servant, minister) or *Vermaner* (admonisher) held an office which entitled the holder to preaching only, mostly in his own congregation, while the elders were traveling extensively in the various congregations of their respective districts. An unusual example of the extensive work of such an elder is found in the list of persons who were baptized by Leenaert Bouwens, extending from Brussels to Emden.[11]

At the Emden disputation the Mennonite representatives were hard pressed because of the fact that their elders traveled extensively visiting different congregations and also because they were questioned about their distinction between elder, preacher, and deacon. Although the Mennonites permitted even deacons to preach, the major ecclesiastical performances were reserved for the elder. This regulation they supported by quoting Scripture passages.[12] In the beginning the number of elders was small. Those who were to practice the full ministry (*voller Dienst*) were usually selected from among preachers and were then ordained as elders or bishops by laying on of hands.[13] This ordination entitled the elder not only to preach and assume leadership in the congregation, but also to baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, and ordain preachers and elders, and exercise discipline, which functions the common preacher could not fulfill.

The elders, and particularly the preachers, did not receive a fixed salary partly because the early Anabaptists were strongly opposed to the practices along these lines prevailing in state churches. The prevalent corruption and lack of integrity, religious convictions, and sincerity they linked to the practice of hiring and paying the ministry for its services. A voluntary church membership and a voluntary ministry with personal conviction and high moral integrity was the aim. This, however, did not mean that the elder was not to receive support and aid out of "the hand of the God-fearing dis-

10 *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* (1877), 62-93.
11 K. Vos, "De Dooplijst van Leenaert Bouwens," *Bijdr. en Mededeel. v. Hist. Gen.* (1915), 36:39 ff.
12 *Protocol . . . (op. cit.),* 233a, 240b.
13 Krahn, *op. cit.,* 147.

ciples," so that the elder could take care of his spiritual duties.[14] In the Emden *Protocol* Brixius Gerrits says: "To the question whether a congregation should support the minister it has called in a Christian way, we say yes. But we do not know whether they should have had a fixed income."[15]

Rues says that during the early eighteenth century the conservative groups of the Netherlands still adhered to the practices of the early days.[16] The elder specially ordained for these functions was the only minister who baptized, administered the Lord's Supper, and ordained ministers. He was always the chairman of the church council and took the initiative in matters pertaining to the congregation. The conservative groups were, in principle, opposed to a specially trained ministry, basing their argument in part on statements of the early Anabaptists, while the more progressive Mennonites of Holland soon realized the necessity of a specially trained leadership. The latter probably found as much justification in the writings of the early Anabaptists as the former. Although the early Anabaptist leaders strongly denounced the misuse of learning among the theologically trained ministers of the state churches, they hardly ever said anything against training as such. On the contrary, they made full use of it.[17]

Among the Waterlanders the distinction between the elders and preachers soon disappeared. In Rotterdam this distinction was given up in 1687, when the elder died and the three remaining ministers were authorized to perform all functions on equal terms. Among the Groningen Old Flemish, where the old practice was adhered to longest, the elders were also known as *opzieners* or *commissarissen*. When the more progressive urban Mennonite congregations of Holland felt the need for a trained ministry they accomplished their purpose by calling physicians or other educated members of the congregations into the ministry and eldership. These, in turn, promoted the establishment of a seminary for the training of ministers. With this change, the office of elder was considerably altered. Formerly the elder served several congregations, having a number of co-ministers as assistants. Congregations then chose the elder from among the preachers, who usually had been chosen out of the congregation. With the special theological training of young men interested in serving as ministers the whole system was gradually altered and finally disappeared. The minister now did not necessarily keep his charge

14 Menno Simons, *Complete Works*, 2:31 ff. 341 ff.
15 *Protocol*, 233b.
16 Rues, *Aufrichtige Nachrichten von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande der Mennoniten oder Taufgesinnten* ... (Jena, 1743), 27-30.
17 Krahn, *op. cit.*, 109 ff.

for life. Soon there was only one minister in each congregation and his ordination authorized him to act at once both as elder and preacher, performing all ministerial functions in the congregation.

This new system, started as an accommodation to the need of the day, spread from Holland to the neighboring German congregations, such as Crefeld, Emden, Hamburg-Altona, and Danzig, and finally to the Palatinate. Needless to say there was often a difference of opinion regarding this new system which sometimes caused schisms in congregations. There was usually the intellectual urban wing urging the calling of a specially prepared minister, and a conservative rural population opposing this change. However, the unwillingness, and sometimes inability, of lay ministers to cope with the multiple and complex problems and responsibilities of urban congregations compelled congregations to accept this change. In Holland the majority of congregations accepted this change during the eighteenth century, while the neighboring German Mennonite congregations inaugurated it during the nineteenth century, often calling on trained Dutch Mennonite ministers. The Danzig Mennonite congregation elected Jacob van der Smissen in 1826 as its first theologically trained preacher, but he did not become the elder of the congregation. Later Elbing followed. However, most of the rural Prussian Mennonite congregations retained the traditional system of elders to the end of their existence in 1945. Here the preachers, and particularly elders, were usually of the well-to-do class with a fairly good education who could afford to devote a considerable part of their time to their congregational duties. The elders were organized like those in South Germany in a council of elders (*Aeltestenrat*). The elders and preachers together constituted a ministerial body (*Lehrdienst*).

With the above change, the title of the ministers also underwent a change. In Holland, the word for elder (*oudste*) was changed to the title in general use in the state church, *dominee* (abbreviated *Ds.*). The North German and Prussian elders with a theological training, serving the congregations on a salaried basis, are usually referred to as *Pastor,* but also as *Aeltester.*

The Mennonite congregations of Poland never came to the point where the old practice regarding elders and preachers was affected. In Russia the matter of eldership caused considerable difficulty when the Chortitza settlement was established. No elders had joined the immigrants and the one appointed by letter by the home congregation in Prussia was not fully accepted. After the initial difficulty had been ironed out by visiting elders from Prussia, the tra-

ditional elder-minister practice functioned without great change into the twentieth century. The elders and ministers were organized in a *Kirchenkonvent,* the equivalent of the *Lehrdienst* in West Prussia.

With the raising of the educational level and the introduction of secondary schools among the Russian Mennonites during the middle of the past century, the demand for specially trained preachers and elders increased. It gradually became the practice to elect preachers from the ranks of the teachers, who sometimes combined the two professions. Thus at the turn of the century most of the elders had secondary school training. With the interest in mission work and the training of missionaries in foreign schools came also the demand for the establishment of a theological school; and when this did not materialize, the training of some ministers and evangelists in Swiss and German Bible schools and theological seminaries was the result. Although there was a trend away from the older system in which the elder had charge of a number of congregations and ministers in addition to his own, a radical change did not take place. Theologically trained and conference-appointed traveling evangelists received some remuneration, as did also some elders, but the system of an unsalaried ministry in general prevailed. On the whole, the development in this matter was about the same among all groups of Mennonites in Russia. The tradition and practice regarding elders and preachers among the Mennonite Brethren congregations was more or less the same.

The Mennonite immigrant congregations of Prussian, Polish, and Russian background of the prairie states (USA) and the provinces of Canada maintained the traditional office of an elder who was assisted by preachers and who was often in charge of a number of congregations. For many years lay preachers were elected from the midst of the congregation. Gradually, with the advancement of secondary education and the felt need for an English-speaking, theologically trained ministry, the practice in the United States was completely changed, very much after the pattern introduced in the Netherlands. This applies especially to the General Conference Mennonite congregations and the Mennonite Brethren. Most of their congregations are now served by men who voluntarily chose the work of a minister by majoring in Bible in college or attending a theological seminary or Bible school, and who have received a call from a congregation to serve full-time on a contract basis. Most of these ministers are ordained at one and the same time as preachers and elders and thus perform all of the ministerial functions. Occasionally, during the period of transition, some of the old lay preach-

ers also continue to preach. Thus each congregation is served by a preacher-elder who performs all functions and who can resign and accept the call of another congregation. This change is almost complete in all congregations of the above-mentioned background in the United States.[18] The Mennonite Brethren have completely dropped the office of elder and the ordination for it.

In Canada, where the more conservative element settled during the 1870's and where the more recent Mennonite immigrants from Russia are predominant, the old system still prevails, although it is apparent that a change is coming.[19] Elders of the Rosenort Mennonite Church, the Blumenort Mennonite Church, the Bergtal Mennonite Church, the Schönwiese Mennonite Church, and others still have charge of several congregations, assisted by a number of preachers, and are the only ones who administer baptism and the Lord's Supper and ordain ministers. However, in the Mennonite Brethren Church, where the office of elder has been completely dropped and the office of elected "leader" substituted, and in the recently established General Conference congregations, particularly in the cities, the minister is often in charge of one congregation only, and in some instances has no assistant ministers. With the demand for college- and seminary-trained, English-speaking ministers, the usual change will likely take place soon. In the more conservative groups such as the Old Colony Mennonites of Canada and Mexico, the Sommerfelders of Canada, Mexico, and Paraguay, and the recent immigrants from Russia and Prussia to South America, the old system of eldership will likely prevail for some time to come.

With the change from the German language to the English, the title *Aeltester,* which was the only form in use, has been translated elder, although Canadian groups, particularly when dealing with the public and government, use the Anglican title bishop. However, generally speaking, the title elder will probably disappear since the commonly used title, "The Reverend," in its abbreviated form "Rev.," is becoming predominant. When referring to the office of minister without the personal name, "minister" is the generally accepted term. "Preacher" is not used as a title preceding the name, as is common among the conservative groups of Pennsylvania-German background. An exception is the Church of God in Christ, Mennonite.

The older method of electing an elder or preacher among the

18 P. K. Regier and I. I. Friesen, "Values and Problems of the Lay and Supported Ministry," in *Proceedings of the Study Conference on the Believers' Church* (Newton, Kans., 1955), 197 ff.

19 *Ibid.,* 197 ff.

Dutch, Prussian, and Russian groups prior to the modern change was usually by majority vote. In some instances, however, the lot may have been used.[20] References to it are extremely rare and the only known present practice is by vote. When at present a minister is to be called, the congregation has a committee to nominate candidates, one of whom is elected by a majority vote, possibly after the congregation has occasion to become acquainted with the candidate.

The office of elder, both in the earlier times (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries) in Holland and North Germany, and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Russia, developed great prestige and power. Certain elders exercised this power in arbitrary and domineering ways, in effect "ruling over" their congregations or districts. In Holland such exercise of authority was a major factor in many of the schisms of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In Russia the village type of settlement, the dominant religious concern, and the prestige of the elder tended to the development of a type of hierarchical theocracy in which at times the elders practically controlled both the civil and ecclesiastical life of the community. The village *Schulze* or mayor seldom acted in cultural matters without the counsel of the elder, and almost never acted against this counsel when it was received. However, there were men like Johann Cornies who successfully steered their own course, with the backing, to be sure, of the Russian governmental authorities. The Prussian and Russian Mennonite society was essentially patriarchal, as was generally the case in the Swiss-South German type also, in which the elder incorporated in his person in a sense both the familial and the ecclesiastical authority. This tradition is continued among the conservative Old Colony Mennonites of Canada, Mexico, and Paraguay. The common Dutch and Low German title *Oom* (Ohm) as applied to the elder symbolized and carried much of this feeling.

20 Krahn, *op. cit.*, 144 ff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

P. M. Friesen, "Der geistliche Charakter der Gemeinde und der Predigerschaft," in *Die Alt-Evangelische Mennonitische Brüderschaft in Russland . . .* (Halbstadt, 1911), 730-66; M. Shelly, "Practices and Trends in Mennonite Congregations," *Proceedings of the Study Conference on the Believers' Church* (Newton, Kansas, 1955), 27ff; H. G. Mannhardt, *Die Danziger Mennonitengemeinde* (Danzig, 1919); S. Hoekstra, Bz., *Beginselen en leer der oude Doopsgezinden . . .* (Amsterdam, 1863); N. van der Zjipp, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Nederland* (Arnhem, 1952).

THE OFFICE OF BISHOP IN ANABAPTIST-MENNONITE HISTORY

Harold S. Bender

"Bishop" is the title used by several groups of Mennonites in America for the highest ministerial office. The corresponding term in Dutch was *oudste* (although *bisschop* was also occasionally used) and in German *Aeltester,* with the English translation "elder." In the United States those groups which descended from European immigrants who arrived after 1800 from Switzerland, Germany, or Russia, and did not affiliate with the Mennonite Church (MC) whose foundation and organization was laid by immigrants from Germany and Switzerland in the eighteenth century, used almost exclusively the German term *Aeltester* and later its English form elder, but those who affiliated with this group adopted the term bishop. However, in Canada, the older congregations of the General Conference Mennonite Church, and the Bergthal, the Kleine Gemeinde, and similar conservative groups use bishop freely in their English usage. The Eastern District Conference of the General Conference Mennonite Church, having originated in 1847-48 in a schism from the Mennonite Church in Eastern Pennsylvania, wavered, first using bishop, but later after affiliation with the newer immigrant groups of the General Conference Church, adopted elder. The following United States groups (and their Canadian congregations) use bishop exclusively: Mennonite Church, Old Order (Wisler) Mennonite Church, Old Order Amish Mennonite Church, Conservative Mennonite Church, Church of God in Christ Mennonite Church, and smaller related groups. Karel Vos claims that *bisschop* was the term used first by Obbe Philips and Menno in the beginning in Holland, later supplanted by *oudste.*[1]

The history of the usage of the term bishop has not been fully traced. Without doubt the Mennonite Church (MC) in the United States is responsible for its introduction into the English ecclesiastical terminology of Mennonites, but exactly when this occurred is not certain. Christian Herr, a leader of the Lancaster Mennonite Conference, wrote a brief article on the Mennonites for I. D. Rupp's *History of all the Religious Denominations in the United States* (Harrisburg, 1848), in which he speaks of the threefold ministry of the Mennonites as "bishops, elders or ministers, and deacons." An 1849 remonstrance by the officials of the Deep Run Mennonite con-

1 K. Vos, "De keuze tot Doopsgezind Bisschop," *Nederl. Archief v. Kerkgeschiedenis XVI* (1921).

gregation of the Franconia Conference against the organization of an Oberholtzer congregation at that place, addressed to the Bucks County Court, is signed by two "bishops," two "ministers," and two "elders," where the title elder means "deacon."[2] The *Ordnung der Mennonitischen Gemeinschaft,* adopted and printed by the Oberholtzer group in 1848, says in the section *Von den Aemtern,* "Die Aemter unserer Gemeinschaft sind dreierlei: Erstens, Das Amt der Bestätigten oder Bischöfe; Zweitens, Das Amt der gemeinen Lehrer oder Prediger; Drittens, Das Amt der Vorsteher oder Diaconen." John H. Oberholtzer himself, though ordained to the office after he left the old church, assumed the title of bishop as is indicated by the title of his 1860 book, *Der Wahre Charakter von J. H. Oberholtzer, Prediger und Bischof . . .* , and the obituary article about him which appeared in the 1896 *Mennonite Year Book and Almanac* calls him bishop and tells of his "ordination to the office of bishop" in 1847. A list of ordained men of the Ontario Mennonite Conference printed about 1853 lists "bishops, ministers, and deacons," and the printed 1864 German minutes of that conference use the German term *Bischöfe.* This conference had strong connections with the Franconia Conference, many of its families having emigrated from that area to Ontario in 1780-1820.

It is possible that the use of bishop was unintentionally promoted by the Dordrecht Confession of 1632 (first German edition 1664, first English edition 1712 in Amsterdam and 1727 in Philadelphia), which, in its various translations, uses the term *bisschop* (Dutch), *Bischof* (German), as well as *oudste, Aeltester,* and elder, and which was adopted as the official confession of the Pennsylvania Mennonites in 1725. At any rate, it seems clear that the Pennsylvania Mennonites as early as 1845 were using bishop in both English and German, and reserved *Aeltester* as the German word for deacon. In view of the traditionalism of this group, it is most probable that this usage goes back into the eighteenth century at least. The Pennsylvania Amish and their descendants must have used *Bischof* (and more recently Bishop) in the German for almost as long.

There is no evidence that *Aeltester* was regularly used for bishop by either the Amish or Mennonite groups of Pennsylvania (and their European Swiss, Alsatian, and South German ancestors). The corresponding German terms which they used were *Bestätigter Diener* (confirmed minister), *Völliger Diener,* or *Voller Diener* (full minister). It is probable that *oudste* or *Aeltester* (elder) was a more char-

2 J. C. Wenger, *History of the Mennonites of the Franconia Conference* (Telford, Pa., 1938), 363.

acteristic Dutch-North German-Prussian-Russian term and only in the nineteenth century came to be used in South Germany, France, and Switzerland, where it has apparently been the standard term for over a century. However, the *Concept van Ceulen* (1591), printed in Holland in 1660, the oldest of the Dutch-Northwest German confessions, uses the term bishop in the following sentence (p. 110), *Een Bisschop of Leeraer sal onstraffelijck sijn.*

The official *Minister's Manual* of the Mennonite Church, first published by John F. Funk at Elkhart in 1890, defines the office of bishop in the following paragraph:

> The bishop or elder in the Mennonite church is simply the minister who has been ordained to the special charge of caring for, and officiating in the church of a certain prescribed district. This district may contain but one place of worship, or a number of places, which are at considerable distances from each other. He may have a number of fellow ministers in his charge, to preach at the various places, and aid him in his work generally.

Earlier each congregation (the Amish still have this practice) had a bishop, several preachers, and one or two deacons, the number of preachers and deacons depending somewhat upon the size of the congregation. As the Mennonite settlements in Eastern Pennsylvania and Ontario and elsewhere expanded the new congregations were considered as daughters of the older, and usually the bishop simply continued to exercise oversight over the daughter congregations as well. In fact the entire settlement was usually thought of as one congregation. This accounts for the rise of the "bishop district" (or diocese, although this later term was almost never used), which in its largest extent seldom had more than five to eight congregations and 1,500 to 2,000 members, often much less. The daughter Mennonite conferences followed the Lancaster-Franconia pattern of bishop districts. The Amish never permitted this evolution, however, and both the original Pennsylvania communities and the daughter Amish settlements have continued to adhere to the practice of each congregation having its own bishop. Among the Old Order Amish a new congregation or "district" is not considered fully organized and independent until it has its own independent bishop chosen from its own membership. The history of the Canadian General Conference Mennonite Church and related groups reveals the same pattern and development as that of the Eastern Pennsylvania Mennonites, only more sharply defined, with one bishop having oversight of as many as 15 to 30 congregational groups, all viewed as one congregation or *Gemeinde.* For example, the Bergthal Church in Manitoba with almost 3,500 members and over 20 groups, until recently had only

one bishop (now two), and the Rosenort Church in Saskatchewan with one bishop (now two) has almost as many congregational groups and members. The Manitoba, Mexico, and Paraguay Old Colony and Sommerfelder groups (all of Manitoba origin) likewise each have only one bishop, no matter how numerous the sub-groups or congregations or how large the membership.

A bishop can normally be chosen only from among the already ordained ministers, although some Amish groups admit deacons to candidacy; thus a bishop ordination is always a second ordination. Usually the administration of ordination, baptism, marriage, the Lord's Supper, and discipline are exclusive functions of the bishop, along with presiding over the congregation in all its worship and business meetings, and carrying pastoral responsibility.

Much prestige has usually attached to the office of bishop in America. This was also the case in Russia and Prussia, and in earlier times in Holland and Germany as well when the term elder meant the same thing as bishop. However, the multiplication of elders in one congregation (Switzerland and South Germany—Badischer Verband), or the practice of ordaining almost all pastors to be elders and doing so almost at the beginning of their ministry, has greatly reduced the prestige and significance of the office in those groups where this is done, e.g., the General Conference Mennonite Church in the United States. When all pastors become bishops there is no longer a bishop in the older sense.

Usually the differentiation between bishop and minister has not been one of rank so much as of function; accordingly in conference work and organization ministers usually have equal rights and privileges with bishops. An exception to this rule is the practice which has evolved through the years in the Lancaster Conference and to a lesser degree in the Franconia Conference, both Mennonite (MC), of treating the group of bishops as a sort of upper house in the conference, like the House of Bishops in the Episcopal Church of the United States. The group is called the Bishop Board, and in the Lancaster Conference has the sole right to initiate legislation in the conference sessions. Ministers are allowed to vote but not to "gainsay" the bishops. The Bishop Board meets in advance of the full session of conference to prepare the business and recommendations for the full conference.

There are in the Mennonite Church (MC) about 570 congregations and 71,500 members, with roughly 180 bishops, 860 ministers, and 380 deacons. The Old Order Amish with 15,000 members in 160 congregations have 161 bishops, 381 ministers, 155 deacons. The

Conservative Mennonites with almost 6,000 members in 42 congregations have 42 bishops, 76 ministers, 18 deacons. The Old Order Mennonites with 5,500 members in 45 congregations have 11 bishops, 50 ministers, and 34 deacons. The Kleine Gemeinde of Manitoba with 2,000 members has 2 bishops, 17 ministers, 6 deacons. The Bergthal Church in Manitoba with 3,500 members has 2 bishops and 21 ministers. The General Conference Mennonite Church in Canada with 15,500 members in 63 congregations has 32 bishops or elders (only 18 have died in the entire history of the conference), and 240 ministers.

NINETEENTH CENTURY EMIGRANTS FROM THE MENNONITE CONGREGATION OF FRIEDELSHEIM IN THE PALATINATE

Fritz Braun*
(Translated by Don Yoder)

The Mennonite congregation of Friedelsheim in the Palatinate has in its possession two old church registers. The first book was begun August 1, 1833, the second in the year 1861. The first book contains entries arranged by family; in the latter the births of the congregation's members have been entered chronologically. To these birth records are added, in columns provided for the purpose, references to the subject's marriage and death. Both of these church registers contain notations on the emigration of members.

In the present article the compiler has taken the names of emigrants as listed in the registers and has arranged them into their proper family relationships. He has shown who their parents were and how the emigrating families were interrelated. To the basic data provided by the two church registers he has added additional materials obtained from other church and town archives, from old records and letters, and from newspapers and publications both Palatine and American. In many cases this additional material has yielded references to the emigrants' places of settlement in America, so that the list has been made more valuable both for the families still in the Palatinate and those abroad. The Palatine families can find where they must turn when they seek the emigrated branches of their families; the American branches can find their forefathers in the land of their origin. These references to the goal of emigration are, however, not complete; but we can count on filling in the missing data through the growing research among the American branches of these families.

Economic motivation accounts for the emigration of these Mennonites. As emigrants they formed part of the unbroken stream of hundreds of thousands of Germans who made their way to North America during the entire nineteenth century. Possibly the percentage of emigrated Mennonites may be somewhat higher than among other groups, since in following their religious orientation they preferred agriculture to other spheres of activity. Since the op-

*Dr. Fritz Braun is Director of the *Heimatstelle Pfalz* in Kaiserslautern, Germany, and an editor of the quarterly *Pfälzische Familien- und Wappenkunde*, in which the present article is appearing, in German, in installments. His special field of interest is the emigration from the Palatinate into all parts of the world, including the United States. Professor Don Yoder of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., the translator, is collaborating with Dr. Braun in gathering manuscript sources for a complete study of the Swiss migration to the Palatinate and the further emigration of the Swiss-Palatine families to the United States.

portunities on the farms which they were cultivating as owners or tenants remained limited, some of the children of each generation found it necessary to provide themselves with new employment. An old woman from one of the emigrant families in the 1830's made this remark: "Until 1833 the wine years and income had been bad, but when they (the emigrants) left, then the good years came." This observation, of course, is only partially true; better and worse years did come, yet the emigration never came to a standstill.

The emigration of these Mennonites did not take place entirely without planning. One emigrant family helped another. As soon as they reached the European ports, Rotterdam and Le Havre, they sent letters back to their home communities, giving complete reports, with recommendations and warnings. Nearly every emigrant family had addresses of relatives, friends, and acquaintances in America, who soon after their arrival were sought out, with whom they could if need be find temporary shelter, and whose experiences were of value in choosing a place of settlement and the best possibilities of making a living.

It is remarkable how inclusive was the emigrants' knowledge of relationship to emigrated relatives and countrymen. Often it continued over long periods of time. In 1832 Katharina Risser could report to her mother in Kindenheim, that immediately after her arrival in Philadelphia she had called on the daughter of a Mr. Haas from Dürkheim, and again that with her entire family she had visited Uncle Martin Mellinger in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, who gave them a hearty welcome. She describes how deeply they were all impressed when they heard from Uncle Martin how often their American cousins had prayed that the Lord might conduct them safely "over water and land." "Uncle Mellinger" had emigrated sixty years previously, arriving in Philadelphia on the ship *Crawford* in 1772. Johannes Blickensdörfer from the Kohlhof, who likewise appears in the following list, went immediately after his arrival in America, in 1833, to Canal Dover, Ohio, to find a grandson of Christian Blickensdörfer who had emigrated from the Kohlhof in the year 1753. The grandson then offered him employment making barrels for his gristmill business.

Through excerpts from letters which appear after individual names, the reader will learn many valuable particulars; these references help to complete the picture of this group of emigrants and permit many sociological conclusions. The compiler wishes to thank the minister of the Mennonite congregation of Friedelsheim, Johannes Foth, for permitting him the use of the church registers. He

thanks also Mr. Emil Würz of Biedesheim and Miss Lina Blickensdörfer of the Kohlhof for their friendly permission to use old emigrant letters in their possession.

Emigrants from Friedelsheim

1. Magdalena Berg, widow, daughter of Abraham Risser, miller at the Osthof (no longer in existence) near Wachenheim, and wife Katharina nee Bergtholdt; born at the Osthof, February 26, 1799; married at Wachenheim (Kreis Neustadt), October 9, 1823, to Jakob Berg, miller (son of Johann Berg, miller, and his wife Elisabetha Riess), born at St. Johann near Alpersweiler (Kreis Bergzabern), December 17, 1799. Jacob Berg died before 1844; his widow emigrated to the United States, April 10, 1844, with the following children, settling in Ashland, Ohio:

   a. *Katharina,* born July 18, 1824, at St. Johann near Alpersweiler; died March 14, 1825, at St. Johann.
   b. *Elisabeth,* born March 28, 1826, at St. Johann near Alpersweiler; married November 13, 1845, in the United States, to Valentin Hahn from Gerolsheim (Kreis Frankenthal).
   c. *Lene,* born *ca.* 1828.
   d. *Maria.*

Cf. below, Abraham Risser (43), her father, and Abraham Risser (48), her brother. A letter dated *"Heswill"* (Hayesville), Ohio, U.S.A., May 5, 1844, from Anna Krehbiel (Krebill), to her brother-in-law Jacob Leisi in Friedelsheim, tells us "From Mrs. Berg we heard everything correctly. Her youngest daughter Katharina is with us; we are all glad to have her. When Mrs. Berg came, we wanted to write you at once. . . ."

2. Christian Bergthold, son of Abraham Bergthold and wife Susanne Krebe (Crebill, Krehbiel); born at Friedelsheim, February 21, 1807; emigrated to the United States from Friedelsheim (Kreis Neustadt) *ca.* 1832, with his brother Abraham Bergtholdt.

3. Abraham Bergtholdt, brother of (2); born at Friedelsheim, July 11, 1808; emigrated to the United States from Friedelsheim *ca.* 1832, with his brother. In the year 1845 he was living three miles from Dover, Ohio.

4. Christian Bergtholdt, son of Jakob Bergtholdt and wife Barbara Krehbiel from Heppenheim an der Wiese; born at Friedelsheim, December 7, 1839; emigrated from Friedelsheim in September, 1859, to the United States.

5. Philipp Eduard Bergtholdt, son of Johannes Bergtholdt and wife Babette nee Bergtholdt; born at Friedelsheim, August 26, 1873; emigrated to the United States.

6. Johannes Blickensdoerfer, farmer, son of Jakob Blickensdoerfer and wife Magdalene nee Wagemann; born at the Kohlhof (Kreis Ludwigshafen), August 7, 1809; emigrated 1833, on the ship *Marengo,* to the United States. Arriving at Canal Dover, Ohio, October 7, 1833, he settled next to Jakob Blickensdoerfer, a grandson of Christian Blickensdoerfer, who had emigrated from the Kohlhof in 1753. Johannes married in the United States and had the following children:

a. Two sons and a daughter, all died before 1839.
b. *Peter,* born November 17, 1841.
c. *Helena Margareta,* born May 8, 1843.
d. *Elisabeth,* born November 15, 1846.
e. Son, died before 1853.

Cf. below, Christian Ellenberger (13), a brother-in-law. Johannes Blickensdörfer writes from Dover, Ohio, October 13, 1833, to his parents, the Jakob Blickensdörfers at the Kohlhof near Schifferstadt:

> We were thirty-six days on the sea, with two days of storm, when the ship lay on its side. The journey to Le Havre cost me 41.5 francs, across the ocean 85 francs. When we got to Dover, we looked up Blickensdörfer, who bade us a friendly welcome. My dearest sister and her child have died, and Cousin Lichti too. We have been here at Cousin Blickensdörfer's now for five weeks. I'm boarding with Cousin and am treated like a son of his. Cousin has a mill, where every day they need fifty flour barrels and it's agreeable to him if I make barrels for him. He will give me 30 cents apiece for them; 40 cents here make one gulden. I want to inform you how far we are from each other—6249 miles—that's quite a piece! Dover lies on the canal, a village which is very pretty. We have visited three Blickensdörfers: the farthest away lives twelve miles from Dover; two of them have six hundred acres of land; the cousin in Dover is the richest.

The above-mentioned "Cousin Blickensdörfer" was a grandson of Christian Blickensdoerfer, born at the Kohlhof, March 6, 1724, who emigrated to America in 1753. The grandson was named Jacob and was born at Lititz, Pennsylvania, December 26, 1790.

7. Wilhelm Blickensdoerfer, son of Jakob Blickensdoerfer and his wife Anna Maria Moellinger; born at the Kohlhof, September 3, 1838; emigrated 1860, to St. Louis, in the United States. He was married but died childless.

8. Jakob Blum, son of Johann Blum and wife Veronika Grebilt (Grebel, Krehbiel); born at Wachenheim, October 25, 1783; married at Wachenheim, May 26, 1813, to Christina Finger (daughter of Jakob Finger and wife Christine nee Risser), born at Wachenheim, September 18, 1792; emigrated 1843 from Wachenheim to the

United States, with wife and four children. Blum's children, all born at Wachenheim, were as follows:

a. *Abraham,* born June 21, 1817.
b. *Maria Susanna,* born April 23, 1821; married September 14, 1843 (Church Register, Friedelsheim).
c. *Jakob,* born March 21, 1825.
d. *Johannes,* born March 26, 1829.

Cf. below, JOHANNES FINGER (21), Blum's brother-in-law.

9. MARGARETHA DEISINGER, daughter of MATTHAEUS DEISINGER, husbandman, and wife MAGDALENE nee HERZLER; born at Alsheim-Gronau, November 26, 1819; emigrated *ca.* 1840 from Alsheim-Gronau (Kreis Ludwigshafen) to the United States. Cf. below, JAKOB GOEBEL (24), her brother-in-law.

10. ABRAHAM DEUTSCH, son of JOHANNES DEUTSCH and wife BARBARA nee BEHR (BAER); born at Assenheim, August 14, 1813 (Church Register, Hochdorf); emigrated 1840 from Assenheim (Kreis Ludwigshafen) to the United States with his brother JOHANNES.

11. JOHANNES DEUTSCH, brother of (10); born at Assenheim, March 25, 1816 (Church Register, Hochdorf; but born October 21, 1816, according to the Church Register, Friedelsheim); emigrated 1840 from Assenheim to the United States with his brother ABRAHAM.

12. HEINRICH ELLENBERGER, farmer, from Gönnheim, later tailor and grocer, preacher; son of CHRISTIAN ELLENBERGER, vineyardist, and wife KATHARINA nee STAUFFER; born 1784/85; married (1) ELISABETHA HERZLER; married (2) at Eppstein, April 29, 1829, to KATHARINA nee EICHER (widow of JAKOB SCHOWALTER [of Ruchheim], daughter of JAKOB EICHER [died at Bornheim] and wife MARIA nee LEONARD), born *ca.* 1805. Moved in 1824 from Friedelsheim to Eppstein (Kreis Frankenthal). Emigrated 1850 with wife and children (except son HEINRICH) and settled in Donnellson, Iowa, 1851, where he served as the first Mennonite preacher. Children:

a. *Katharina,* born May 9, 1809, at Friedelsheim.
b. *Abraham,* born August 5, 1817, at Friedelsheim.
c. *Elisabeth,* born December 26, 1819, at Friedelsheim.
d. *Jakob,* born October 12, 1821, at Friedelsheim.
e. *Heinrich,* born August 10, 1823, at Friedelsheim.
f. *Barbara,* born June 27, 1827, at Eppstein.

13. CHRISTIAN ELLENBERGER, cooper, son of JOHANNES ELLENBERGER and wife SUSANNA BERGTHOLDT; born at Friedelsheim, December 5, 1804; married at Schifferstadt (Kreis Speyer), April 24, 1831, to ANNA EVA BLICKENSDOERFER (daughter of JAKOB BLICKENSDOERFER

and wife MAGDALENA nee WAGMANN), born at the Kohlhof, April 12, 1806; emigrated with wife and child, June 1, 1833, from Friedelsheim to the United States. Arrived at Dover, Ohio, September 7, 1833. Anna Ellenberger died September 27, 1833, in Dover. Their child, *Anna Maria,* born Friedelsheim, June 24, 1832, died at Canal Dover, Ohio, September 15, 1833. Cf. below, ABRAHAM LICHTI (36).

Anna Ellenberger sent a letter to her parents and brothers and sisters from Le Havre, June 28, 1833, in which she reports:

> We are all well again, except my Maria, who was sick the whole way and cut three teeth. When we stopped for dinner, I always had to run after water, to wash the diapers. She still has the cough, and walking goes badly with her. Today for the first time she walked again. I think she will learn it on the ship.

Christian Ellenberger reports from Canal Dover, Ohio, October 11, 1833, to his father-in-law Jacob Blickensdörfer at the Kohlhof near Schifferstadt:

> On June 1st we set off from Friedelsheim. Our journey through France proceeded happily in spite of the many difficulties. On July 4th at 10 o'clock in the morning our ship, the *Marengo,* set sail, and the second day we had left Europe quite out of sight. We had a good sea voyage, yet my dear wife had much to go through. On August 7th we were greeted by the captain with the joyous news that he saw land and on that very same evening we sailed into the harbor of New York. In New York we had to stay until the 15th, then we traveled by steamboat to Albany and from there on a canalboat to Buffalo, where we arrived on the 24th. Cousin Bergtholdt was in the city and was expecting us. Our joy was great, to see a kinsman and friend of our youth in a strange land far from home. In Buffalo we rented a house, where we could live until we continued our journey further. During our stay in Buffalo we visited our friends Bergtholdt and Hemmerer [Kämmerer], who live four hours from there. They're getting along fine.
>
> On September 2d we began our journey to Cleveland, where we arrived on the 3rd. Now we had reached the State of Ohio, in which we hoped to found our new home. In Cleveland lodgings were so scarce, that there were hardly any to be had, yet Lichti, Leisi and Krebiel and still other traveling companions resolved to stay there. They rented a very bad house for their families, while the men wanted to look around here in this neighborhood.
>
> My dear wife wasn't feeling well in Cleveland and we were so tired of the traveling and lack of rest that we wished soon to come to rest. From Cleveland to Dover we still had a journey of about thirty hours. We made up our minds to travel there in the hope of getting perhaps a good lodging provided by Cousin Blickensdörfer, until we had looked around further. My wife, Barbara, Johannes and I and our little Marie thus said good-by to the remaining friends and traveling companions and arrived on the morning of the 7th in Dover.

In the same letter Christian Ellenberger reports to his father-in-law on the death of his little daughter Marie and his wife, who had

not been able to recover from the exertions of the journey. He continues:

We found it better here than we had imagined. Dear good friends, of whom there are many living in the neighborhood, sympathized warmly with me in my hard luck. The cooper trade has good prospects in this neighborhood. Cousin Jacob Blickensdörfer has work for more than twelve coopers. He has a mill where 50 flour barrels are needed every day. These barrels each hold about 100 liters. The flour is exported and no barrel comes back. He also has 300 pigs. The meat is likewise exported in barrels. There is thus a great need for coopers. Cousin was glad when he heard that we are coopers. I bought ten acres of land for 150 dollars. It's still all woods, however. It lies on the canal and near Cousin's mill. I bought it from Johannes Blickensdörfer, who lives not far from here. We are having a dwelling built on it and with God's help want to begin here.

14. Barbara Ellenberger, sister of (13); born at Friedelsheim, November 21, 1810; emigrated June 1, 1833, with her brother and his family, to the United States. In her later years she lived in Cleveland, Ohio. Barbara Ellenberger reports from Le Havre on their land journey:

We arrived safe and sound in Le Havre, although on the way everyone was sick a few days, yet they recovered again. Some were badly attacked and had to spend a few days in bed, which was in the back of the wagon and came in very good; also in the inns, for already the first night we had to unpack our beds and make a sleeping-place on the floor. Our traveling organization consisted of 107 persons, of whom most had come from the region of Worms. It was a pretty procession, when all nine wagons drove along together. It's amazing what a crowd of emigrants there is here. The whole city is full of them and for the most part such as are unable to pay their passage.

15. David Emanuel Ellenberger, son of Jakob Ellenberger, preacher, and wife Lisette nee Blickensdoerfer from the Kohlhof; born at Friedelsheim, April 27, 1835; emigrated April 27, 1862, to the United States. Married in the United States.

16. Carl Christian Ellenberger, brother of (15); born at Friedelsheim, January 13, 1837; emigrated to the United States in November, 1867. Married in the United States.

17. Jakob Nathanael Ellenberger, brother of (15-16); born at Friedelsheim, May 9, 1838; emigrated December 26, 1862, to New Zealand. Married in New Zealand.

18. Elise Katharina Ellenberger, sister of (15-17); born at Friedelsheim, November 19, 1839; emigrated December 26, 1862, to New Zealand. Married in New Zealand to Karl Meng, born in Obersülzen (Kreis Frankenthal). Elise Katharina Meng died March 29, 1879.

19. Adolf Ellenberger, preacher, son of Johannes Ellen-

BERGER, coachmaker, and wife KATHARINA nee BEUTLER from Sembach; born at Friedelsheim, May 31, 1885; married January, 1917, to ADELE MUELLER from Derschlag, Rheinland; emigrated 1923 (?) to the United States.

20. JAKOB I. EYMANN, farmer, son of JOHANNES EYMANN and wife KLARA SCHNEIDER; born at Kindenheim *ca.* 1798; died in the United States before 1857; married (1) ANNA EYMANN (daughter of CHRISTIAN EYMANN and wife ANNA BARBARA KREMER), widow, born at Ober-Flörsheim (Kreis Alzey), April 22, 1799, died at Biedesheim (Kreis Kirchheimbolanden), September 5, 1837; married (2) in the year 1838 to MARIA KREHBIEL (daughter of CHRISTIAN KREHBIEL and wife KATHARINA nee KREHBIEL), born at Weierhof (Kreis Kirchheimbolanden), July 22, 1807, died at Ashland, Ohio, 1857. Emigrated to the United States in 1845, with wife and children, settling in Ashland, Ohio, where he bought a farm of 160 acres for $3300. Children of the first marriage, all born at Biedesheim:

a. *Christian,* born April 19, 1822; married ANNA KREHBIEL.
b. *Marie,* born March 28, 1824; married 1845 to PETER SCHOWALTER (son of JAKOB SCHOWALTER and wife ELISABETH KREHBIEL nee KAEGY), born at the Weierhof, October 17, 1819. He bought a farm of 80 acres for $1600, beside his father-in-law, in Ashland, Ohio.
c. *Elisabeth,* born August 19, 1826; married (1) JAKOB RISSER; married (2) [———] SCHWAN. Cf. (51).
d. *Johannes I.,* born August 3, 1829; married [———] KREHBIEL.
e. *Katharina,* born September 13, 1831; married in the United States, to CHRISTIAN HIRSCHLER.
f. *Jakob,* born December 18, 1833; died at Biedesheim, July 17, 1834.

Children of the second marriage, all born at Biedesheim:

g. *Jakob,* born September 4, 1839.
h. *Peter,* born December 16, 1842.
i. *Daniel,* born August 3, 1844.

Cf. below, JAKOB RISSER (51), son-in-law of Jacob Eymann.

21. JOHANNES FINGER, widower, vineyardist, eldest son of JOHANN FINGER, tailor, and wife BARBARA nee KIEFERNDORF; born at Wachenheim, June 13, 1786; married at Wachenheim, May 8, 1811, to MAGDALENE FINGER (daughter of JAKOB FINGER, miller [born *ca.* 1755], and wife CHRISTINA nee RISSER), born at Wachenheim, May 3, 1794, died at Wachenheim, September 19, 1830, aged 36 years. Johannes

Finger emigrated from Wachenheim to the United States in March, 1840, with the following children

a. *Barbara,* born September 1, 1813, at Wachenheim.
b. *Elisabetha,* born October 16, 1815, at Wachenheim (Church Register, Friedelsheim, says October 5, 1815).
c. *Magdalene,* born July 3, 1818, at Wachenheim.
d. *Christina,* born August 18, 1820, at Wachenheim.
e. *Jakob,* born October 24, 1823, at Wachenheim.
f. *Anna Maria,* born December 8, 1825, at Wachenheim.

Cf. above, JAKOB BLUM (8), brother-in-law of Johannes Finger.

22. JAKOB FORRER, son of ABRAHAM FORRER of Ibersheim and wife MAGDALENA (nee WUERTZ) from Quirnheim; born September 1, 1871; baptized at Sembach, August 31, 1884; emigrated from the Binshof (Kreis Speyer) to the United States.

23. MARIE FORRER, sister of (22); born at the Binshof, January 5, 1879; baptized at Friedelsheim, June 5, 1892; emigrated to the United States.

24. JAKOB GOEBEL, son of HEINRICH GOEBEL and wife KATHARINA BURKHOLDER; born at Gerolsheim (Kreis Frankenthal), September 19, 1806; married at Alsheim-Gronau, October 3, 1832, to ANNA MARIA DEISINGER (daughter of MATTHAEUS DEISINGER and wife MAGDALENE nee HERZLER), born at Alsheim, October 16, 1802. Emigrated to the United States with wife and children in 1846. Children:

a. *Katharina,* born November 5, 1833 (Church Register, Friedelsheim, says October 12, 1842), at Alsheim-Gronau. Died October 2, 1834.
b. *Magdalena,* born September 21, 1835, at Alsheim-Gronau.
c. *Barbara,* born March 18, 1840, at Alsheim-Gronau.
d. *Margareth,* born September 12, 1842 (Church Register, Friedelsheim, says October 12, 1842), at Alsheim-Gronau.
e. *Elisabeth,* born May 11, 1846, at Alsheim-Gronau.

Cf. above, MARGARETHA DEISINGER (9), sister-in-law.

25. JAKOB HANDRICH, Protestant, son of VALENTIN HANDRICH and wife ELISABETHA DEUTSCH; born at Assenheim, October 8, 1806; married at Assenheim, August 29, 1837, to KATHARINA NEFF (daughter of ABRAHAM NEFF and wife MAGDALENA KREHBIEL), born at Assenheim, December 18, 1808. Emigrated to the United States in 1843 from Assenheim. One child: *Jakob,* born February 18, 1838, at Assenheim. Cf. below, JOHANNES NEFF (37), brother-in-law.

26. CHRISTIAN HEGE, property owner at Dürkheim, who before his marriage lived on the Branchweilerhof (Kreis Neustadt), was the adopted son of CHRISTIAN HEGE, property owner of Branchweilerhof,

and wife CHRISTINE nee ELLENBERGER; born at the Spitalhof, October 15, 1793; married at Dürkheim, June 26, 1820, to CHRISTINA BERGTHOLDT (daughter of JOHANNES BERGTHOLDT, vinegar manufacturer in Dürkheim, and wife MARGARETHA STAUFFER), born at Dürkheim, December 27, 1799. Emigrated to the United States from Dürkheim (Kreis Neustadt) *ca.* 1845 with wife and children, eleven persons in all. In 1846 he bought land in the vicinity of Cleveland, Ohio. Children, all born at Dürkheim:

a. *Christian,* born April 20, 1821; shot himself, June, 1846.
b. *Johannes,* born August 16, 1822.
c. *Magdalena,* born March 24, 1824; married 1845-46, in the United States, to [----] UMSTAETTER.
d. *Margaretha,* born October 27, 1826.
e. *Catharina,* born August 28, 1828; died at Dürkheim, May 13, 1829.
f. *Elisabetha,* born February 27, 1830.
g. *Maria,* born February 12, 1832.
h. *Christine,* born May 11, 1833.
i. *Jakob,* born July 12, 1835.
j. *Heinrich,* born April 22, 1840; died at Dürkheim, March 15, 1841.

27. DAVID HIRSTEIN, son of CHRISTIAN HIRSTEIN and wife MARGARETE BERGTHOLDT; born at Erpolzheim (Kreis Neustadt), 1805; married at Alsheim-Gronau, January 10, 1837, to ANNA RINGS (daughter of JOHANNES RINGS, husbandman, and wife ELISABETH nee BERGTHOLDT), born at Alsheim-Gronau, March 20, 1810. Emigrated to the United States after 1839, with wife and child. Children, born at Alsheim-Gronau:

a. *Johannes,* born January 12, 1838; died February 9, 1838.
b. *Johannes,* born August 6,1839.

Cf. below, JOHANNES RINGS (42), father-in-law.

28. GEORG PETER KLING, son of JOHANN WILHELM KLING and wife MARGARETHA LANG; born at Kleinkarlbach, March 29, 1831; married at Friedelsheim, January 28, 1847, to CHRISTINA PLETSCHER (daughter of ISAAK PLETSCHER and wife MARIA nee LATSCHE), born at Friedelsheim, June 7, 1824. Emigrated to the United States after 1847, from Kleinkarlbach (Kreis Frankenthal). Cf. below, JAKOB PLETSCHER (39), brother-in-law.

29. ABRAHAM LEISY (LEISI), called *"Burger-Leisi,"* from 1812 to 1820 deacon *(Vorsteher)* of the Mennonite congregation of Friedelsheim, son of JOHANN LEISY, miller at the Nächstmühle near Ramsen, and wife DOROTHEA LINKENSCHEID (LINDSCHEID); born at Friedels-

heim, January, 1783; married (1) KATHARINA LICHTI (daughter of CHRISTIAN LICHTI and first wife ELISABETH DESTER), born February 23, 1783, died March 4, 1812. Married (2) at Friedelsheim, December 1, 1812, to ELISABETH RISSER (daughter of JAKOB RISSER and wife ELISABETH DESTER?), born at Friedelsheim, November 29, 1793. Emigrated to the United States with wife and children in 1833, sailing from Le Havre on the ship *Marengo,* a party of nine persons. He took along also JAKOB RISSER (son of his brother-in-law DANIEL RISSER), born at Ober-Flörsheim, December 12, 1815, who settled in Cleveland, Ohio. The parents and brothers and sisters of JAKOB RISSER followed in 1836. Children, all born at Friedelsheim (Kreis Neustadt):

a. *Elisabeth,* born September 30, 1813.
b. *Katharina,* born May 19, 1816.
c. *Maria,* born July 20, 1817.
d. *Johannes,* born July 18, 1819.
e. *Anna,* born February 21, 1822.
f. *Jakob,* born February 15, 1824.
g. *Charlotte,* born January 7, 1833.

Cf. also JOHANNES PLETSCHER (38), brother-in-law; also DANIEL RISSER (45) and JAKOB RISSER (44).

30. ABRAHAM LEISY (LEISI), son of ABRAHAM LEISY and wife ELISABETH; born at Friedelsheim, April 16, 1802; married February, 1826, to KATHARINA ROHRER (daughter of JOHANNES ROHRER, farmer, and wife ANNA MARIA LEHMANN), born at Eppstein, March 22, 1805. Emigrated to the United States, April 13, 1855, from Friedelsheim, with wife, children, and daughters-in-law, a party of fourteen persons. Children:

a. *Maria,* born at Friedelsheim, December 12, 1826; died at Friedelsheim, August 31, 1837.
b. *Johannes,* born at Friedelsheim, July 4, 1828; married at Alsheim-Gronau, March 17, 1853, to CHRISTINA SCHOWALTER (daughter of CHRISTIAN SCHOWALTER and wife MAGDALENA nee BAER, from the Grenzhof near Heidelberg), born at Alsheim-Gronau, July 24, 1831.
c. *Jacob,* born at Friedelsheim, June 10, 1830; married at Alsheim-Gronau, March 8, 1855, to LISETTE SCHOWALTER (daughter of CHRISTIAN SCHOWALTER and wife MAGDALENA nee BAER, from the Grenzhof near Heidelberg), born at Alsheim-Gronau, November 11, 1833.
d. *Elisabeth,* born at Friedelsheim, August 15, 1832.
e. *Abraham,* born at Friedelsheim, November 22, 1834; married to BABETTE SCHOWALTER (daughter of CHRISTIAN

Schowalter and wife Magdalena nee Baer, from the Grenzhof near Heidelberg), born at Alsheim-Gronau, January 7, 1835.

f. *Katharina,* born at Friedelsheim, November 13, 1836; died at Friedelsheim, June 28, 1837.

g. *Isaak,* born at Friedelsheim, June 26, 1838.

h. *August,* born at Friedelsheim, August 19, 1840.

i. *Rudolph,* born at Friedelsheim, June 29, 1842.

j. *Anna Maria,* born at Friedelsheim, January 26, 1845.

k. *Heinrich,* born at Friedelsheim, September 26, 1847.

A letter from Jacob Risser to relatives in the Palatinate, dated Cleveland, Ohio, June 6, 1875, gives us this information:

> Now something about Isaak Leisy's brewery. It is the finest and largest here in the city of Cleveland. A sixteen horsepower steam engine drives the machinery; the boiler holds 12,000 to 14,400 liters. In the winter they brewed around four and five times a week, now seven and eight times, and in the summer nine and ten times. He has twenty-four horses to carry the beer away, and two large ice-houses to keep the cellar cold and cool the beer. In the month of May Leisys sold $28,000 worth of beer.

If these Palatine emigrants succeeded in making passable beer in their new homeland, they still kept importing Palatine wines from the mother country. Jacob Risser, who had emigrated in 1874 to Cleveland, and was living there near Isaak and August Leisy's brewery, in a letter to his Cousin Johannes (presumably in Biedesheim), under date of August 31, 1875, offers great praise to the Palatine vintages:

> When last spring Isaak Leisy's Friedelsheim wine arrived here in Cleveland and I tried it, I had to shake my head, for the American wine can't hold a candle to the German wine. Isaak Leisy got out his scales and the result was, the American wine weighs not quite 4 degrees, the German something over eight. Great applause to the German vintage! The last wine year is said to be seldom excelled and is not at all unfavorable to the Palatines.

31. Jakob Leisy (Leisi), son of Johannes Leisy (born at Friedelsheim, May 28, 1787, died at Friedelsheim, February 21, 1870) and wife Elisabeth Lehmann (born at Heppenheim an der Wiese, March 1, 1788); born at Friedelsheim, December 4 or 25, 1810; married in Bavaria to Maria nee Strohm, daughter of Johannes Strohm and wife Barbara Lehmann. Emigrated in 1852 to the United States. Before his emigration he was living at Fränking in Bavaria, where he had settled in 1840. No children were born to this couple. Jakob Leisy's last residence in the United States was Summerfield, St. Clair County, Illinois. Cf. father-in-law, Johannes Strohm (62).

32. Johannes Leisy (Leisi), brother of (31); born at Friedelsheim May 20, 1820; emigrated to the United States. In the Church Register of Friedelsheim there is reference to his drowning in America.

33. Catharina Leisy (Leisi), sister of (31-32); born at Friedelsheim, October 23, 1823; emigrated to the United States, but died during the Atlantic crossing.

34. Maria Leisy (Leisi), sister of (31-33); born at Friedelsheim, October 15, 1839; emigrated to the United States.

35. Christiana Leisy (Leisi), sister of (31-34); born at Friedelsheim, August 5, 1841; emigrated to the United States.

36. Abraham Lichti (Lichty), son of Christian Lichti and wife Elisabeth Christophel; born at the Branchweilerhof near Neustadt, October 3, 1792; died at Cleveland, Ohio, 1833. Married at Friedelsheim, June 17, 1813, to Elisabeth Moellinger (daughter of Elie Moellinger and his wife Susanne Ellenberger nee Bergdolt), born at Neustadt-Haardt, June 12, 1793. Emigrated to the United States on June 29, 1833, on the ship *Marengo*, with his wife and children. In 1845 his family was in Trenton, Tuscarawas County, Ohio, residing on a property of 160 acres. Children, all (except Christian) born at Friedelsheim:

a. *Elisabeth,* born February 29, 1814; married in 1843, in the United States, to Ernst Krakau, widower, from Saxony.
b. *Johannes,* born November 9, 1818; died at Friedelsheim, March 28, 1819.
c. *Christian,* born [———]; married in 1844, in the United States, to Katharina Remmel.
d. *Maria,* born April 20, 1821.
e. *Susanna,* born December 6, 1822.
f. *Jakob,* born May 6, 1826; was living 1893 near Gnadenhütten, Tuscarawas County, Ohio; his daughter Anna went out in that year to Alaska as a missionary.
g. *Christine,* born November 15, 1830; died at Friedelsheim, May 17, 1831.
h. *Abraham,* born August 4, 1832; died at Friedelsheim, September 10, 1832.

Elisabeth Lichty, nee Möllinger, writes on June 27, 1833, to Daniel Risser's wife in Friedelsheim, describing the tedious land journey to the port of Le Havre:

> All of you who intend to follow us should avoid joining large parties [the best is] two or at the most three families, mostly because of the night's lodgings. A few times we were compelled to separate ourselves from the

entire party. Of cooking utensils take with you a pan, tin coffee cups, also coffee pots, a copper pot with legs or a tripod for it, spoons, forks, plates, knives and bowls, and all kinds of little items. Take sugar along, too, coffee roasted and ground, well packed and bound with a bladder, some dried meat, yet not much and boiled at home, dried fruit, rice, butter, cheese, flour, vinegar, wine and brandy and not much bread. All these things however, only for the journey through France, where everything costs about a third to a half more than at home. In Le Havre you can get all this cheaper than at home, as you can see from our Christian's letter. For families with small children it is not advisable to travel through France in the autumn and spring. We made use of our coats all the way through France. The 19th of June we arrived in Le Havre. Three of the party went on two days ahead and rented two rooms with two fireplaces for us, where it is possible to cook. We pay daily two francs rent. Here we can cook for ourselves and we make our beds on the floor. As soon as our affairs were a little in order, we went to the harbor, which cuts through the city, as it were. Now the entire party made an agreement with a mail ship, with the exception of ourselves, Leisis, Wolf and Koch from Wachenheim, and one named Henninger from Silzen [Obersülzen] with his family. This man has his mother with them, a woman of 79 years. Umstätter of Winzingen came along too. We made an agreement on the 25th to sail on a merchantman, costing about 80 francs for big and small. The others on the mail ship had to pay 95 francs. In a few days the ships' prices fell so much. Today, the 26th, we are beginning to drive our chests there. But there is yet no day set, when we sail.

On June 28, 1833, she writes from Le Havre to her sister, Anna Blickendörfer, at the Kohlhof near Schifferstadt:

Today, the 28th, fairly recovered from our journey, we go with bag and baggage onto the ship *Marengo*. As they say, we sail tomorrow. The entire journey went, with all its difficulties, pretty well, thank God. For my part I have not lost faith. I arrived at quarters every evening tired and worn, but every day God again gave me new strength to travel on. On such a journey and in such a company one's patience is often tested. Whoever stood this testing best, came through best. Dearly beloved sister and brother-in-law, we are feeling now more than ever the tender remembrance of you, when we are a bit at rest. Do not wait till we write from America. Address your letter to Joh. Risser so that we see soon how things are going with you and who intends to follow us.

Cf. also Christian Ellenberger (13).

37. Johannes Neff, son of Abraham Neff (December 15, 1783-February 21, 1855) who married, May 18, 1807, Magdalena nee Krehbiel from the Lohmühle near Langmeil (October 30, 1783-February 27, 1837); born at Assenheim, February 19, 1814; emigrated from Assenheim to the United States in 1840. Cf. Jakob Handrich (25), his brother-in-law.

38. Johannes Pletscher, son of Heinrich Pletscher and wife Katharina Brenneman; born at Friedelsheim, October 24, 1780; married at Friedelsheim, April 15, 1811, to Elisabeth Leisy (Leisi) (daughter of Johann Leisy, miller at the Nächstmühle in Eisenberg, wife Dorothe Lindscheid), born February 26, 1793. Emigrated to

the United States from Friedelsheim in 1833, with wife and children, a total of nine persons. Children, born at Friedelsheim:

a. *Heinrich,* born August 13, 1813. Cf. Maria Pletscher (40).
b. *Daniel,* born May 3, 1815.
c. *Anna,* born November 14, 1816.
d. *Abraham,* born August 18, 1819.
e. *Katharina,* born October 1, 1821.
f. *Dorothea,* born February 5, 1829.
g. *Maria,* born May 4, 1833.

Cf. brother-in-law Abraham Leisy (29).

39. Jakob Pletscher, son of Isaak Pletscher (born at Friedelsheim, August 15, 1791) and wife Maria nee Latscha (born at Friedelsheim, January 8, 1792); born at Friedelsheim May 7, 1815; married at Friedelsheim, November 24, 1842, to Anna Pletscher (daughter of Daniel Pletscher, July 22, 1784-September 27, 1863, and wife Barbara nee Leisy [Leisi], January 26, 1797-May 20, 1826), born at Friedelsheim, March 28, 1818. Emigrated to the United States, August 24, 1855, with wife and children, a total of seven persons. Children, born at Friedelsheim:

a. *Daniel,* born February 27, 1844.
b. *Isaak,* born December 24, 1846.
c. *Heinrich,* born December 24, 1848.
d. *Jakob,* born June 30, 1851.
e. *Johannes,* born January 11, 1855.

Cf. brother-in-law Georg Peter Kling (28); sister-in-law Maria Pletscher (40); and brother-in-law Abraham Risser (50).

40. Maria Pletscher, daughter of Daniel Pletscher (July 22, 1784-September 27, 1863) and wife Barbara Leisy (Leisi) (January 26, 1797-May 20, 1826); born at Friedelsheim, July 10, 1825; married to Heinrich Pletscher (*q.v.* above, under 38, son of Johannes Pletscher and wife Elisabeth Leisy), born at Friedelsheim, August 13, 1813. Emigrated to the United States in 1841. Cf. brother-in-law Jakob Pletscher (39) and Abraham Risser (50); and father-in-law Johannes Pletscher (38).

41. Johannes Pletscher, brother of (39); born at Friedelsheim, February 27, 1826; married at Friedelsheim, April 1, 1852, to Nanette Lack, daughter of Maria Sophia Franziska Rosina Lack nee Meckenheim. Emigrated to the United States in 1852.

42. Johannes Rings, born *ca.* 1782; married at Alsheim-Schauernheim, January 27, 1803, to Elisabeth Bergtholdt; emigrated to

the United States in 1843 from Alsheim (Kreis Ludwigshafen) with his wife and children. In 1851 Daniel and Christian Rings were living at Donnellson, Iowa. Children, born at Alsheim-Gronau:

a. *Anna,* born March 20, 1810; married David Hirstein (27).
b. *Jean,* born May 2, 1813, is not named among the children who emigrated with the parents.
c. *Heinrich,* born March 20, 1816.
d. *Christian,* born January 23, 1818.
e. *Daniel,* born April 28, 1820.
f. *Katharina Elisabeth,* born December 24, 1821.
g. *Daniel,* born March 2, 1828.

Cf. son-in-law David Hirstein (27).

43. Abraham Risser, tenant and miller at the Osthof near Wachenheim; born at Wachenheim, 1770 or 1771; married to (Anna) Katharina Bergthold (Bergtholdt) from Grethen, who died at Wachenheim, August 13, 1822. All the children except Barbara emigrated to the United States. In 1836 they informed their father that he should follow them; the children would raise his passage money among them. Children, all born at Wachenheim:

a. *Magdalena,* born February 26, 1799. Cf. above, Magdalena Berg (1).
b. *Johannes,* born July 2, 1800 (47).
c. *Abraham,* born October 11, 1801 (48).
d. *Catherine,* born July 9, 1803; died in the United States.
e. *Barbara,* born May 21, 1805; married in the Palatinate; was called *Madam Hauber* (*Hauwer*).
f. *Elisabeth,* born March 26, 1807; died in the United States.
g. *Jakob,* born January 29, 1809; was in 1836 a confectioner in Cincinnati, Ohio; later in Ashland, Ohio.
h. *Christine,* born February 15, 1811; died in the United States.
i. *Anna Marie,* born January 29, 1813; died in the United States.
j. *Christian,* born May 26, 1814; died at Wachenheim, June 3, 1814.
k. *Christian,* born July 31, 1816; died in the United States.
l. *Daniel,* born July 28, 1819; died in the United States.

One of the daughters was married to Jakob Schmidt; he was a farmer and in 1846 was living in the neighborhood of Ashland, Ohio.

44. Jakob Risser, son of Jakob Risser and wife Elisabeth Dester; born 1782; married at Friedelsheim, October 29, 1811, to Elisabeth Schreyer (Protestant, daughter of Jakob Schreyer and

wife MARIA BARBARA SCHERF nee KRATZ), born February 28, 1789. Emigrated to the United States after 1836 with his family, a total of six persons. Children, born at Friedelsheim:

a. *Elisabeth,* born June 22, 1813; married at Friedelsheim, December 22, 1836, to JOHANN ADAM STAFF.
b. *Johannes,* born September 28, 1817.
c. *Jakob,* born November 2, 1820.
d. *Abraham,* born January 17, 1824.
e. *Daniel,* born January 3, 1831.

Cf. brother-in-law ABRAHAM LEISY (29).

45. DANIEL RISSER, widower, brother of (44); born at Friedelsheim, August 25, 1784; married at Ober-Flörsheim, May 26, 1811, to ELISABETH SCHMITT, daughter of HEINRICH SCHMITT and wife BARBARA nee CHRISTOFFEL. Elisabeth died at Ober-Flörsheim, November 3, 1825. Emigrated to the United States, April 6, 1836, with his three daughters, and settled near ABRAHAM LEISY (LEISI), called "Burger-Leisi" (29). Children, born at Ober-Flörsheim:

a. *Maria,* born October 12, 1813.
b. *Jakob,* born December 12, 1815; had already emigrated to the United States in the year 1833 with his uncle ABRAHAM LEISY from Friedelsheim.
c. *Elisabeth,* born July 2, 1817; died soon after her arrival in America.
d. *Barbara,* born July 14, 1820.

Cf. brother-in-law ABRAHAM LEISY (29).

46. JOHANN [ES] RISSER, from 1825 to 1832 Mennonite preacher in Friedelsheim, son of JEAN RISSER and wife MARIE nee STROHM; born at Friedelsheim, November 27, 1787. Married at Kindenheim (Kreis Frankenthal), May 23, 1813, to KATHARINA WEBER (daughter of JEAN WEBER and wife KATHARINE nee MOELLINGER), born at Kindenheim, August 11, 1790. Emigrated to the United States in 1832 with wife and children, sailing from Bremen on the ship *Elisabeth,* July 18, 1832. Settled in Mifflin Township, Richland County, Ohio. He served as Mennonite preacher in Ashland County, Ohio. Children, born at Friedelsheim:

a. *Johannes,* born April 12, 1816; married in the United States; was in 1837 a baker in Cleveland, Ohio; in 1850 had one son, born *ca.* 1848.
b. *Jakob,* born June 11, 1819 (51).
c. *Abraham,* born December 7, 1820; died in the summer of 1846, of fever, in Ashland, Ohio.
d. *Peter,* born July 7, 1822; married in the United States; had

in 1850 two sons, born *ca.* 1847 and 1849; in 1865 was resident in Illinois.

e. *Daniel,* born May 2, 1824; teacher; had one daughter.

f. *Elisabeth,* born October 9, 1825; died in Friedelsheim, July 13, 1827.

g. *Charlotte,* born September 14, 1827; married in the United States; had in 1850 two daughters, born *ca.* 1847 and 1849.

h. *Elisabeth,* born November 12, 1829; married in the United States; music teacher.

i. *Maria,* born July 6, 1831; in 1865 was still in her parents' home.

To the family also belongs *David,* who in 1865 was running his father's farm. Risser's hired girl PHILIPPINE had married JACOB BEUTLER in the United States before 1837. For the complete story on this family's emigration, see Don Yoder (Ed.), "From the Palatinate to Frontier Ohio: The Risser Letters, 1832-1833," in the MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1956.

47. JOHANNES RISSER, miller, son of ABRAHAM RISSER (43); born at Wachenheim, July 2, 1800; died in the United States, 1841; married BARBARA GOEBELS nee ENGEL, who died in the United States, 1835. BARBARA (ENGEL) GOEBELS was the daughter of JAKOB ENGEL and the widow of CHRISTIAN GOEBELS of Hertlingshausen, preacher. Johannes Risser, wife and children, emigrated in 1833 to the United States, settling in Ohio.

A. Children of CHRISTIAN GOEBELS and wife BARBARA ENGEL:

a. *Magdalena Göbels,* born August, 1818; died in the United States.

b. *Elisabeth Göbels,* born March, 1820; died in the United States.

B. Stepchildren of BARBARA ENGEL (children of the widower CHRISTIAN GOEBELS from his first marriage):

a. *Johannes Göbels.*

b. *Samuel Göbels.*

C. Children of JOHANNES RISSER and wife BARBARA (ENGEL) GOEBELS:

a. *Jakob,* born July 7, 1825, at Wachenheim; in 1888 was living at Mansfield, Ohio; had children.

b. *Johannes,* born May 5, 1828, at Wachenheim.

c. *Heinrich,* born September 17, 1829, at Wachenheim.

48. ABRAHAM RISSER teamster and vineyardist, son of ABRAHAM RISSER (43), miller at the Osthof, and his wife KATHARINA nee BERGTHOLDT; born at the Osthof (no longer in existence) near Wachen-

heim, October 11, 1801; married to KATHARINA SINNSENICH. Emigrated to the United States after 1840 from Grethen (Kreis Neustadt) with his children, a total of eight persons. Children, born at Grethen·

a. *Abraham,* born November 21, 1827.
b. *Katharina,* born September 11, 1829.
c. *Johannes,* born September 7, 1831.
d. *Jakob,* born November 22, 1833.
e. *Daniel,* born January 2, 1836.
f. *Heinrich,* born February 4, 1838.
g. *David,* born April 6, 1840.
h. *Christian,* born June 9, 1842; not named among the children who emigrated.

Cf. also MAGDALENA BERG (1), sister of ABRAHAM RISSER.

49. JAKOB RISSER, son of ABRAHAM RISSER and wife KATHARINE LEISY; born at Friedelsheim, October 5, 1812; emigrated to the United States *ca.* 1840.

50. ABRAHAM JAKOB RISSER, son of PETER RISSER and wife MARIA LEISY; born at Friedelsheim, December 31, 1817. Married at Friedelsheim, May 14, 1844, to KATHARINA PLETSCHER (daughter of DANIEL PLETSCHER and wife BARBARA LEISY), born at Friedelsheim, July 7, 1819. Emigrated to the United States from Friedelsheim in 1854, a total of five persons. Children, born at Friedelsheim:

a. *Peter Wilhelm* (called *Peter*), born December 23, 1844.
b. *Hermann August* (called *Hermann*), born May 19, 1847.
c. *Maria,* born June 5, 1850.

Cf. brother-in-law JAKOB PLETSCHER (39) and sister-in-law MARIA PLETSCHER (40).

51. JAKOB RISSER, son of (46); born at Friedelsheim, June 11, 1819; returned to his birthplace to marry. He was married at Biedesheim, March 3, 1845, to ELISABETH EYMANN (daughter of JAKOB EYMAN and wife ANNA nee EYMANN), born at Biedesheim, August 19, 1826. He left Biedesheim for the United States, with his wife and his parents-in-law, sailing from Le Havre, April 31 [*sic*], 1845. He died of consumption in Ashland, Ohio, in June, 1846. He had bought a farm of 75 acres next to his father-in-law's for $1800. He had one child, born in the winter of 1845/46, died June, 1846. His widow married (2) in the United States, [——] SCHWAN.

A letter of Anna Krehbiel (Krebill) dated *Heswill* (Hayesville), Ohio, May 5, 1844, to her brother-in-law Jacob Leisi in Friedelsheim, reports on Jakob Risser:

> Our brother's son Jacob (he intends a trip to Germany) can tell you everything better orally, because he is acquainted with everything that

has happened in years past and how things are going in our family. A little more on the reason behind Jacob's journey. For a few years now the thought has been troubling him that he is not following his calling, he should be working in the Lord's vineyard. He thinks he doesn't have enough education for that, so he tries constantly to free himself of the thought, but in vain. After a long inner struggle he revealed it to his parents, who however made quite other proposals to him. Out of love and obedience to his parents he is following their advice, but his inmost being gets no rest. So he lives in the hope that God will direct his destiny. Now for a few months he has not been quite well, so that it was necessary to call a physician. The doctor gave, as we think, the turn of the scales; for he says, in order completely to recover his health he could do nothing better than to make a sea voyage; that will help him more than his medicine.

A letter of Johann Risser to his son Jacob in Biedesheim, written from Ashland, Ohio, March 13, 1845, gives us information of the son's intended marriage:

Dear Jacob! Last week we received your letter of March 3rd and learned with pleasure and joy of your engagement to Elisabetha Eymann; in this your parents and all your brothers and sisters concur. Now it is our wish and prayer that without further ado you may become legally married, and may the Lord with His grace and goodness be with you, that you have a safe journey home to us; and that your marriage may be and become a Christian one, accompanied ever by love and peace. May you find nourishment and shelter in industry and faithfulness, and may your Christian life be a blessing for yourselves, for your brothers and sisters and parents, for your friends and neighbors who will surround you, for church and state, and so become a blessing for time and eternity. This can happen, will happen, must happen, if you remain in humility, keep the faith, exercise prayer, walk in the precepts, commands and ordinances of God, and have and preserve God ever before your eyes and in your heart. . . .

The remainder of the letter deals with money matters and family concerns, and repeats a request for a German piano. "The piano should be quite beautiful and quite good, even if it costs a hundred dollars. The kind that Jacob Risser and Leisys have, has not turned out too well." The writer also reiterates Peter's request for "the lovely book, Klopstock's *Messias*." A sickle is to be purchased, and "Mother would like to have ten pounds of *good* prunes *(Zwetschen)* brought along."

Cf. above Jakob I. Eymann (20).

52. Johannes Risser, widower, brother of (50); born at Friedelsheim, January 21, 1820; married at Friedelsheim, December 20, 1843, to Christina Risser (daughter of Daniel Risser and wife Maria nee Lichti), born at Friedelsheim, February 8, 1822, died at Friedelsheim, December 4, 1879. Emigrated to the United States, February 21, 1881, with his son Christian. Children, born at Friedelsheim:

a. *Jakob,* born January 16, 1846; emigrated to the United States in 1874.

b. *Christian,* born December 19, 1849; married [———] nee MEINHARDT.

53. DAVID RISSER, brother of (50) and (52); born at Friedelsheim, May 31, 1826; married at Friedelsheim, April 14, 1853, to CHRISTINA HUBACH (daughter of JAKOB HUBACH and wife BARBARA BLAUL), born at Friedelsheim, April 13, 1826; emigrated to the United States from Friedelsheim after 1853.

54. PETER RISSER, brother of (50) and (52-53); born at Friedelsheim, July 24, 1835; emigrated to the United States from Friedelsheim *ca.* 1855.

55. JOHANNES SCHNEBEL, born ca. 1818; baptized at Friedelsheim, March 20, 1831; emigrated to the United States.

56. PETER SCHOWALTER, son of HEINRICH SCHOWALTER and wife VERONIKA (NEYT? NEFF?); born November 1, 1818; died in the United States.

57. JOHANNES SCHOWALTER, son of JOHANNES SCHOWALTER and wife MAGDALENA nee HIERSTEIN (HIRSCHSTEIN); born at Assenheim, August 24, 1821; emigrated from Assenheim to the United States in the year 1848 or 1850, with his brother Christian.

58. JACOB SCHOWALTER, brother of (57); born at Assenheim, February 23, 1824; likewise emigrated from Assenheim to the United States 1848 or 1850.

59. CHRISTIAN SCHOWALTER, brother of (57-58); born at Assenheim, November 11, 1828; married in the United States, October 25, 1855, to ROSINA HEFFNER of Donnellson, Iowa. Emigrated together with his brother Johannes in 1848 or 1850 from Assenheim to Hayesville, Ohio, and later settled at Donnellson, Iowa. Christian Schowalter served as preacher for 43 years, and as teacher for 39 years, at Donnellson. He was a co-founder and secretary of the General Conference Mennonite Church and a founder of Bethel College; he was also a homeopathic physician. Of his children, *Christian* was still living, in 1947, at Fort Madison, Iowa.

60. HEINRICH SCHOWALTER, son of ABRAHAM SCHOWALTER (born at Assenheim, February 13, 1817) and wife ELISABETH LEISI (born at Friedelsheim, October 11, 1817); born at Assenheim, December 15, 1844; died at Halstead, Kansas, April 30, 1885. He was married at Friedelsheim, July 3, 1875, to ANNA MARIA RISSER (daughter of JAKOB RISSER and wife ANNA PLETSCHER), born at Friedelsheim, December 31, 1850. Emigrated to the United States with wife and children, May 15, 1883. Children, all born at Friedelsheim:

a. *Friederich Wilhelm,* born April 27, 1876.
b. *Anna Elisabeth* (called *Anna*), born June 5, 1877.
c. *Elisabeth Maria* (called *Elisabeth*), born September 4, 1878.
d. *Jakob Abraham,* born September 25, 1879.
e. *Heinrich Peter,* born May 5, 1881.

61. Abraham Schowalter, brother of (60); born at Assenheim, September 21, 1855; married at Friedelsheim, September 18, 1886, to Katharina Wilhelmina Risser (daughter of Jakob Risser, cabinetmaker, and wife Anna Pletscher), born at Friedelsheim, August 19, 1858. Emigrated as single man to Halstead, Kansas, September 22, 1879. Returned to Friedelsheim 1886 for his marriage and left again for America on September 22, 1886. On April 27, 1890, he came again to Friedelsheim with his family, but returned to the United States, with his family, in 1903. Children:

a. *Johannes Jacob* (called *Johannes*), born Halstead, Kansas, July 18, 1887; baptized at Friedelsheim, October 5, 1902.
b. *Wilhelm Peter* (called *Wilhelm*), born at Friedelsheim, March 26, 1892.
c. *Maria Elisabeth,* born at Friedelsheim, April 28, 1893.
d. *Elisabeth Katharina,* born at Friedelsheim, February 16, 1896.

62. Johannes Strohm, farmer; preacher (1821-47; born at Kriegsheim (Kreis Worms), July 16, 1781; died at West Point, Iowa, September 2, 1852. Married at Kriegsheim, November 31 [*sic*], 1802, to Barbara Lehman, born at Heppenheim an der Wiese (Kreis Worms), April 26, 1782, died at Schwaig near Wagenried (Kreis Dachau), Bavaria, February 18, 1833. Emigrated in 1852 with numerous children and grandchildren. Before his emigration he had moved, in 1820, to Schwaig. Children:

a. *Heinrich,* returned from Bavaria to the Palatinate.
b. *Peter.*
c. *Katharina.*
d. *Maria,* married to Jakob Leisy (31).
e. *Barbara,* married [————————].
f. *Susanna,* died at Wagenried, June 17, 1820.
g. *Christian,* died at Wagenried, January 5, 1823.

Cf. son-in-law, Jakob Leisy (31).

Life and Times of Daniel Kauffman. By Alice K. Gingerich. Scottdale: Herald Press, 1954. Pp. 160.

Any adequate story of Daniel Kauffman's life must be more than a biography. It must also be an account of an era in American Mennonite history. For Kauffman was the greatest and most influential of a remarkable group of men who, finding the Mennonite Church of their day lacking an explicit theology, a clear voice, and an organization for working, proceeded within one generation to state its doctrine, to speak its message in a Bible-teaching program and in literature, and to set up a church-wide conference and the committees and boards which it needed to function in its ministry as a church. No one who writes about Kauffman will be able to ignore the interesting current of life of which he was so essential a part; and the adequacy of the biography will depend upon the biographer's ability to appraise a movement quite as much as upon a close knowledge of the man.

When the Historical Committee of the Mennonite Church asked Alice Kauffman Gingerich to write the biography of her father, they were asking for a particular kind of biography. They wanted someone who knew him intimately to collect and preserve the essential facts of his life, and to picture his character and personality. They wanted an authentic portrait which those who knew him would approve, and which would help a later generation to understand and appreciate one of the great figures of Mennonite history. And they got that kind of biography, clearly written and authentic in its portraiture. Alice Gingerich writes as one who knows her subject well. She had the help of her mother's memory and of letters from many persons. She had the files of the magazines which her father had edited and the books which he had written. It is evident that she deeply loved and respected her father; and yet she has been as objective as one could expect a daughter to be. This reviewer has not detected any errors of fact, and we do not believe anyone will ever seriously question the judgments which she has made.

Nevertheless, this probably will not be the only appraisal which we shall require of the life and work of this man. As is to be expected, the book is best in those parts which picture Kauffman's early years and his life with his family. The chapters that portray his work as churchman seem to be written at one remove. One should not expect a daughter, a housewife, even though a minister's wife, to have the perspective of the historian or the theologian. She was too close to her subject, both in relationship and in time. Someone else will need to make the full appraisal of the man and of the movement of which he is a symbol. A generation which can see the projection of his life and influence down the years may see strengths and limitations to which we are still largely blind.

This book will serve, then, as a very good intimate portrait of the man Daniel Kauffman. We are fortunate in having so good a one, and it deserves a wide reading, not only by those who knew him, but also by those who will wish they could have. But it is not the historian's account of the era and of the developments of which Daniel Kauffman was an indispensable part. The book which will give that may still be some years away.

Scottdale, Pennsylvania PAUL ERB

The Alpha and The Omega: A Restatement of the Christian Hope in Christ's Coming. By Paul Erb. Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1955. Pp. 153. $2.50.

The Conrad Grebel Lectureship is rapidly establishing itself as a channel for effective expression in distinctive areas of thought "of interest and value to the Mennonite Church and to other Christian people." Fourth in this series, *The Alpha and The Omega* is making a genuine contribution of giving direction, providing a pattern, and establishing a standard for this lectureship.

The author, Paul Erb, is well known in Mennonite circles as editor of the *Gospel Herald,* the official organ of the Mennonite Church. Formerly dean of Hesston College, for several years professor of English at Goshen College, and always a careful Bible student. The author is equipped scholastically to bring to this study the techniques of research as well as a rich and fruitful experience as editor and minister.

Trained in English, the author writes in a simple, forceful style easily understood by the general reader and yet sufficiently technical to speak to the scholar. He has read widely from the various schools of eschatology and has appropriated the best of their constructive thought.

As the subtitle suggests, these lectures are a restatement of the Christian hope in Christ's coming. The author's particular desire is to "lift the discussion of unfulfilled prophecy out of the profitless argument between different schools of thought." He hopes "that this volume will discourage the preaching of speculative, controversial prophetic themes, and encourage the preaching of the certain eschatology on which the Bible speaks with clarity and authority."

This aim should at once make strong appeal to the earnest Bible student and condition him to receive a new perspective of eschatology. In this the author has performed for the general reader a most valued service.

To lift out of the great body of prophetic teachings the loci in which certainty of meaning obtains is a very worthy endeavor. When this is achieved, the areas whose meaning is uncertain rightfully lose significance and should not be allowed to divide Christian fellowship. The author finds eight centers of certainty and devotes the greater part of the lectures to their discussion.

Preliminary to developing these several points of certainty the author devotes three chapters to the study of eschatology. Borrowing Aristotle's description of a dramatic plot, according to which "a whole is that which has beginning, middle, and end," the author shows that Biblical eschatology as a veritable drama possesses these three elements. The beginning is found in the Creation. Advance is made toward the middle by the course of history and prophecy in the Old Testament. The middle of the drama centers in the work of Christ during His earthly ministry. There remains the *end,* the consummation, the denouement, to which history and prophetic prediction lead.

The author proceeds to trace briefly the views on eschatology which have bidden at one time or another for acceptance. The views of the early chiliasts, Augustine, the Reformers, the Anabaptists, the Münsterites, Liberalists, and Premillennialists are given rapid notice. The results of a prevalent neglect of eschatology are seen on the one hand in Dispensationalism and on the other in secular eschatologies. Albert Schweitzer's radical eschatology and the realized eschatology of C. H. Dodd have stirred up a renewed interest in prophetic study. Evidence of eschatology

being given its rightful place is found in the World Council of Churches' choice of the main theme at Evanston.

Realizing the problems encountered in finding certainty in eschatology the author considers some lines of action in the drama. Since the Bible is our only source of information about the future it follows that the Bible is its own interpreter. The "literal" and the "spiritual" methods of interpretation must be subjected to the way in which the New Testament writers interpret the Old Testament. "A proper humility," says the author, "will help the student of eschatology to frankly admit his limits," and will "give a healthy tolerance for the opinions of others."

Coming to the central part of the lectures the author asserts that certainty "concerning the future scenes of the drama of the ages" is to be found "where God has clearly revealed the truth." The author elaborates on this certainty under eight heads. Christ must return: (1) to complete His work, (2) to bring the redeemed into spiritual maturity, (3) to perfect His kingdom, (4) to defeat death, (5) to defeat Satan and Antichrist, (6) to judge the world, (7) to bring final triumph to His church, and (8) to complete His purpose for the world.

In the development of these points we witness the emergence of the truly great certainties concerning the future. The tension of the *now* and the *then*, the *already* and the *not yet*, as it has to do with salvation and sanctification, requires that Christ must come back to complete the work now only partially realized. Eternal life is a present possession and we are heirs according to the hope of eternal life. Both are effected by the Holy Spirit but both are oriented toward the future. Even worship will be perfected by the return of Christ. The denouement pertains also to the kingdom. The kingdom is now here, the kingdom is still future—this tension must be resolved. Christ's return ushers in the perfected eternal kingdom. The differing views concerning the "thousand years" must recede to a place of minor importance as the certainty of the perfected kingdom comes into clear perspective.

Equally imperative is it that death must be defeated. Complete release from the power of death will be realized in the resurrection. The ultimate defeat of God's enemies needs also to be effected. The present tension extends as well to the wrong in this world that requires righting. Judgment is thus a necessity and is clearly also a certainty in eschatology.

The suffering church must become the church triumphant. All of God's purposes for the earth must be fulfilled. Thus history obtains meaning when it is seen as working out the purposes of God. Precisely what will become of this earth is not as important as it is to look for "new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

The closing part of the lectures centers in Christ's admonition, "watch therefore." Both the fact of waiting for the parousia as well as the manner of waiting call for study. Very fittingly the author lays emphasis on "His coming to us, and not our going to Him." The certainty of His coming is of far greater importance than the manner or time of His coming. The return of Christ must be lifted to the place of being "the key to the whole eschatological future." On this account the manner of waiting for it obtains tremendous significance. Accordingly we wait in holy living, in active service, and in loving anticipation.

With full appreciation of the extreme limitations of time imposed on the author the reviewer feels that certain items of eschatological certainty could hardly fail to receive appropriate attention. The first is the chronological framework of the future expressed by the contrast of *this world*

(age) and *the world (age) to come.* See Matt. 12:32; Mark 10:30; Luke 18:30; 20:34-36; Rom. 8:38; I Cor. 3:22; Eph. 1:21; 2:2; I Tim. 4:8; 6:17-19. When this framework is recognized, the fitting into it of the Messianic kingdom as it stands in contrast with the Father's kingdom obtains certainty as shown in Matt. 13:39-43; I Cor. 15:24-28; Col. 1:13 together with Acts 2:36; Eph. 1:20, 21; etc. The *terminus a quo* of the Messianic reign is certainly established at the exaltation of Christ as taught in Matt. 28:18; Acts 2:33-36; Eph. 1:20-23; Phil. 2:9-11; Heb. 1:3; I Pet. 3:22; etc. Of particular significance is the *terminus ad quem* of the Messianic kingdom. Jesus' explanation of the Parable of the Wheat and Tares establishes this point of time at the close (*sunteleia*) of the age. In Paul's language Christ "must reign until he has put all enemies under his feet." Since the last enemy to be destroyed is death, Christ's reign continues until the resurrection when "Death is swallowed up in victory" (I Cor. 15:54).

While Rev. 20:1-10 hardly establishes the certainty of the time and nature of the Thousand Year Reign of Christ, one thing does obtain certainty: Rev. 20:1-10 does describe the Messianic reign of Christ. The *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem* of this reign will need to be determined on the basis of other New Testament teaching.

While the author established clearly the present and future aspects of the kingdom, it appears that he made no distinction between the Messiah's kingdom and the Father's kingdom. The essential difference between these two, however, is pertinent. Under the former the whole work of redemption is subsumed. Matt. 11:27; 28:18-20; John 13:3. It is the time of conquest, of "destroying every rule and every authority and power." The Father's kingdom is the eternal victorious rule after the last enemy death is destroyed. This distinction does not ignore the evident sense of Rev. 11:15. Since the Father and Son are one, Christ shall indeed reign for ever and ever with the Father.

The author has performed a most significant task. It remains for the reader to gain the same perspective with regard to the certainties of eschatology. When these are seen in their proper focus the return of our Lord will again wield its influence as the pole star of Christian hope.

Eastern Mennonite College CHESTER K. LEHMAN

Henry's Red Sea. By Barbara Smucker. Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1955. Pp. 108. $1.65.

Henry always listened breathlessly when Grandma talked about the Bible. "It must be very important," he whispered once to Rudy, looking at the worn leather-bound book with awe and a little fear. "Father had to hide it, and Grandfather was shot because he read it aloud to the people of our town."

"What were you reading about, Grandma?" Henry asked with eagerness as she returned to the group.

"It is one of my favorite stories these days, Henry," Grandma mused in a faraway voice. "It is the story of the children of Israel crossing the Red Sea. The sea was in front of them; there were mountains on both sides. Behind them came their cruel enemies, the Egyptians, driving horses and war chariots. They thought nothing could save them. But God performed a miracle. He parted the waters of the sea and they walked through on dry land. Then the sea closed up behind them again and they were safe" (pp. 10, 11).

Eleven-year-old Henry Bergen, Grandma, Mother, Tina who had

hoped to finish her last year of study to be a teacher, and little lame Rudy, who joined the Bergens when his own mother died as they fled from their former homes, were among the thousand Mennonite refugees waiting in West Berlin for a way to open through Russian-occupied East Germany to the waiting Dutch ship *Volendam* in the harbor of Bremerhaven ready to sail to Paraguay and freedom. The story of how God moved through the Mennonite Central Committee and the American army in Berlin to bring deliverance is a marvelous episode in modern Mennonite history. To have heard it related in person by firsthand witnesses and masterful storytellers like C. F. Klassen and Peter Dyck is an unforgettable experience. Here it is preserved for children by Barbara Smucker in a deeply moving, profoundly spiritual story, *Henry's Red Sea,* an account of the miracle from the viewpoint of an eleven-year-old boy.

An important criterion of a good book for children is that it interest and challenge the respect of the adult reader. *Henry's Red Sea* passes this test both as to content and technique. It also meets the further requirement of appealing to children for whom it is intended. To catch and hold a child's attention a story must reach him through vivid characters, surprise, suspense, and fast-moving action. *Henry's Red Sea* is a good story for children because it includes these necessary elements in an effective plot which moves from episode to episode to a quick climax and to a conclusion which leaves the reader wishing for more story, and yet satisfied that this is the appropriate ending to the book. More than this, the plot contains important content, making Christian truth alive to boys and girls. The book is a powerful sermon on the strength and beauty of Christian love, bringing to children in a concrete, vivid manner the lessons of faith, salvation, forgiveness, peace, and good race relations, even though prayers are answered with both "yes" and "no." These teachings are included in a plot compellingly sketched with skillful reserve and yet with childlike clarity of detail, so that the reader is impelled thoughtfully to consider his own Christian resources as he reads about the Bergens' tests of faith. The children in the story, and the children reading the story, learn what Christian love is by experiencing their elders' response to enemies without revenge in crisis, as well as their thoughtful provision for school and Christmas, making for as normal a child experience as possible in such a time of tense waiting. The "school" and "Christmas" chapters are remarkably effective in their demonstration of the sweet beauty of practical Christian love.

Another illustration of the author's effective presentation of fundamental Christian teaching as an integral part of the episode is found in the following excerpts from the powerful fourth chapter which tells of the first church service held at the MCC center by this large group of pilgrims:

> "Now we will have the sermon," Henry whispered to Rudy, as he tried to remember how Mother had described church. She had told him to listen carefully and if he didn't understand, she would explain after the service.
>
> Henry watched the tall young leader of their refugee center stand.
>
> "I will speak to you today," Peter Dyck said, "of God's great love for every one of us." Henry listened and he could understand! Peter Dyck told them that God loved each of them so much He had given His Son, Jesus Christ, to the world, and that those who believed on Him would live forever. They could live after death in heaven with God!
>
> He told them, too, that God loved the people of the earth enough to give His Son, Jesus Christ, to die on a cross for them.
>
> "Christ died for everyone," Mr. Dyck said clearly, "for refugees and for the Russian communists, too!"

As Peter Dyck continued talking, his voice grew stronger with power and conviction. Henry wondered if the warmth he felt inside came from the love of God. Everyone in the room seemed drawn together. They were like a family united by a loving Father.

"And who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" Peter Dyck had opened the Bible and was reading from it. Then he lifted his head. "Nothing can separate us from Christ Jesus," he told the refugees, "Not death, or sorrow, or hunger, or war, or the communists of Russia, or the cruel deeds they have done to all of you."

Could this really be true, Henry wondered. If it were, then he would no longer need to be afraid. Christ would always be with him!

"Let us pray," said Peter Dyck.

Everyone moved from their chairs and knelt on the floor with their heads bowed. Henry, Rudy, and Tina followed Mother and Grandma.

"Help us to forgive the communists of Russia," Mr. Dyck prayed, "to love them as Christ commanded us to love our enemies. And help us to believe that God can do everything, even when the world about us is dark, and hopeless, and evil."

Henry caught his breath when he heard these words. They were the reason why Grandma prayed for the soldier who shot Grandfather. She was trying to love and forgive an enemy.

Now Henry was beginning to understand, too, what Father meant when he often said, "It takes more courage to love than to hate" (pp. 56, 57).

It is difficult to evaluate one's response to this book apart from the context of the Klassen and Dyck accounts, and also apart from reports of the subsequent settlement in Paraguay. One constantly reads between the lines. How the book will speak to readers approaching it as strangers to the historical setting out of which it comes, remains to be seen; for the book is addressed to such an audience, children from nine to fourteen. From the comments of a number of adult and older child readers who did not previously know the background, the book promises to be a challenging story as it stands. Since it records a specific event in Mennonite history, on the other hand, might the information on the dust jacket, or similar factual background, be included as a footnote to the story in the book itself so as to tie the narrative even more closely to the actual historical setting? Or as a prelude, in the way Eric P. Kelly uses the powerful introduction "The Broken Note" to create the setting for the *Trumpeter of Krakow*? A child, whose teacher during the reading of the story commented on Peter Dyck's account of this miracle, exclaimed delightedly, "Was Peter Dyck a *real* person!" Children, and older readers, are inquiring whether Henry is a particular boy or a composite character. How has the author been able to give such an amazingly convincing firsthand feeling throughout the entire book although she herself was not a part of this group? Or was she? A brief explanation from author to reader of how she came to write the story would enhance its value even more as the actual incident moves farther and farther into the past. Some readers are hoping for a sequel which will tell them what happened after Rudy and Katie and Henry and the other Bergens boarded the *Volendam* for that memorable voyage. Did Tina become a teacher in Paraguay? Tell us how Henry met the exigencies of the new settlement. Was it with the same faith and courage, and the same loyalty to little Rudy, that he displays in this story?

May God speed this little book on its way into the hearts and thoughts of many boys and girls that they may be helped to know and do His good and acceptable will.

Goshen College MARY NEUHAUSER ROYER